William Michel
a old Preacher at Aberdeen
UNMASQUED:

OR,

The *Staggering Instability* of the pretended *Stable Christian* Discovered, his Omissions observed, and weakness unvailed.

In his late faint and feeble Animadversions by way of Reply to a Book Intitled *TRUTH cleared of CALUMNIES.*

Wherein

The Integrity of the *Quakers Doctrine* is the second time Justified, and Cleared from the Reiterate, Clamorous but Causeless Calumnies of this *Cavilling Catechist.*

ABERDEEN · BODLEIAN · LIBRARY

By *ROBERT BARCLAY.*

of Ury nr. Aberdeen

John 16. 2. *They will put you out of their Synagogues, yea, the time cometh, that whosoever killeth you, will think he doth God good service.*

1 John 4. 4. *Ye are of God little Children, because greater is he that is in you, than he that is in the World.*

3 John 10. *Wherefore if I come, I will remember his deeds (which he doth) prating against us with malitious words.*

Printed in the Year, 1672.

110. k. 626 (1.)

The Preface

TO THE

READER.

READER,

HAving ſeriouſly peruſed W. M. his late Animadverſions upon my Book, I find my Judgement of it, though a party concerned, to jump with that which is the ſence of ſeveral juditious perſons, who neither own nor walk in that Profeſſion I am in; and therefore can the leſs be ſuſpected of partiallity, viz: that they coutain nothing of a ſolid or ſatiſfactory reply; for though he ſeemes to take notice of all the particulars mentioned, yet he omits in many, more then the half of what is ſaid by me concerning them, and againſt that which he doth mention in my name, his moſt frequent Argu-

ments are without any Proof; having no other bottom but his owne Judgement, thoughts and conjectures, whereby it ſeemes, forgetting or miſtaking his work, he playes the Catechiſt rather then the Diſputant. This put me to ſome ſtand, whether it was fit to give him any Reply; though truly ſuch as will be at the paines to compare his with my laſt, will need little further, yet knowing how many are apt to take things upon truſt, and to receive Miſrepreſentations concerning us, who are a People ſo generally Reproached, I found it expedient to Write this ſuccinct Reply, which may lead the Reader *to a narrow obſervation of the invalidity of* W. M. *his work againſt us, and may preſent in ſhort his moſt Obvious Omiſſions, his moſt manifeſt Contradictions, unvail his Diſingenuity, lay open his Weakneſs, and ſhew his Unſtabillity, eſpecially ſo far as he has deſerved; moſt of theſe Arguments he uſed in his Dialogue, as not being able further to mantaine them, and diſcover how faintly ſuch new ones as he, doth now bring forth, millitate aginſt us. Let it not ſtartle thee that ſo ſmal*

a bulk

a bulk as this is ſhould anſwer his, for thou mayſt perceive ſeveral pages of his taken up in the Cappital Letters of the contents of his many heads and ſubdivided Sections, which makes it not unlike the City Mindus *whereof the Antients ſpoke, whoſe Gates were ſo diſproportionable in greatneſs to the quantity of the Towne, that a certain Philoſopher is ſaid to have adviſed the Citizens* to ſhut them, leaſt the City ſhould flee out at them. *We may very well ſo far extend the parallel, as to aver, That the Contained in no ways anſwers to the Contents; there is a deal of more Heads, then either Heart or Horns, ſeveral Sections but ſmall Subſtance, and a great ſhew of Method, but very little Matter. I confeſs I might have far more enlarged this Duply, had I taken notice of all the Impertinencies which herein comes under my obſervation, but that the more Judicious, and Intelligent would aſcribe theſe things not ſo much to the* cauſe *as his* weakneſs who managed *it. I deſire to* contend *for* Truth *and not for* Victory, *knowing, though I were ſo minded, the*

Triumph

Triumph *ſhould be but* ſmall *that I could* gain *from ſo* Inconſiderable an Antagoniſt, *therefore* Reader, *I ſhal wiſh thee for the* Truths *ſake* (that thou may be found truly owning it, and not ſomthing elſe in ſtead of it) ſeriouſly to Read and peruſe theſe papers, with ſuch as relate unto them: *And may that Spirit of* Truth *which* teacheth all things, *ſo* direct *thy* Underſtanding, *as thou may* diſcern *what* Doctrine *is* truly *and* really *moſt according to the* holy Scriptures *which thou art* hartily invited *in this matter to* ſearch *and* peruſe, By a well-wiſher of thy ſoul and of all Men.

R. B.

Urie, *the* 24th *of the* 10th
Moneth commonly called
December, 1671.

William

WILLIAM MICHEL

Unmaſqued;

OR

The Staggering Inſtabillity of the pretended Stable Chriſtian Diſcovered, his Omiſſions obſerved, and Weakneſs Unvailed, &c.

THAT which firſt preſents it ſelf to my View is *W. M.* his *Epiſtle* directed to me, and the *Quakers* in and about *Aberdeen*, which he prefixes as his *Conſiderations* upon my *Preface*, but that which is the ſubſtancial part of it, he hath left unanſwered, for my *Preface* was to ſhew the Method of the Prieſts of *Aberdeens* Procedure againſt the *Quakers*, giving account of moſt if not all the papers had paſt betwixt them, and alſo how by their Inſtigation ſome of us had been Impriſoned; particularly the falſeneſs of *G. Meldrum* his way with us, firſt in Pulpit to accuſe us as Hereticks, and then in private to deſire to know of us our Principles, but all this he hath wholly waved, it ſeemes he either could not or would not, defend his own, nor his Brethrens double dealing with us: As to what he mentions I take notice,

Firſt, Of his denying that any in or about *Aberdeen* hath reproached the *Quakers*, as Demented, Diſtracted, or bodily poſeſſed: Checking me for taking things upon Truſt. Well, it ſufficeth me that they are aſhamed of ſuch falſhoods, though if need be, I can inſtance that I had ground to ſay ſo.

Secondly,

Secondly I take notice how that not being willing wholly to clear us, he saith some of us in *England* have given ground to be so charged by their extraordinaryly Trembling, *&c.* but it is strange *W. M.* should so far forget himself as to accompt this a ground to charge People as Demented, *&c.* seeing there was a season wherein himself acknowledged, he seldome or never went to the Pulpit without sensible Trembling, which if he dare to deny I offer to prove by undeniable Testimonies. As to what he adds of Womens going naked in the Streets, and some offering to raise the Dead, alledging for proof *Samuell Clerk*, the *Newcastle Ministers*, *Pagets Herisography*. I Answer, as these calumnies have been particularly answered by our Friends in *England*, so they signifie no more against us being Writ by our declared Enemies, then *Cochlæus* lies against *Luther*, particularly *that he assayed to cast out Devils*, or what the Popish Authors Writes of *Calvine*, *that he made a Living Man counterfeit himself Dead that so he might raise him*, and that *Beza* was Stigmatised for *Sodomie* : and much more of this kind.

Thirdly, The thing I observe is his Comparing us to *John* of *Leyden*, and *Ignatius Loyola*, and that because they Preached in the Streets, cried down Wearing of Rings, and other superfluities as we doe, were against needless Salutations, spoke much of Mortification, and pretended to or expected Immediate Revelation ; but our resembling them in these things, which the Apostles of Christ commanded, and practised, will not prove the Jesuits our Grandfathers, (as *W. M.* terms it) more then their being found in them, will prove them the Grand-children of the Apostles, we must not forsake doing good because hypocrites seem to do so, nor forbear to Preach the Gospel because *Judas* did it, but as for the other practises of *John* a *Leyden*, and *Ignatius Loyola's* followers the Jesuits, to wit, their cutting down all that would not be of their way, their assuming outward Power, their seeking to overturn Kingdoms, their Preaching up War and Blood : the Principles and Practices of *W. M.* his Brethren do declare, how much more they resemble them then the *Quakers*, who from the Pulpit blew the Trumpet of all the late Troubles, Seditions, and civil Dissentions, which have proved so bloody and monstrous to the Inhabitants of this poor Island. And many of them have now turned their backs upon that Cause, which they hunted out others to fight for : and

some

ſome, to wit, *W. N* and his Brethren at *Aberdeen* can find out Jeſuittical diſtinctions, and Mental Revelations, whereby (notwithſtanding they ſwore againſt all deteſtable Newtrality) they can make a ſhift to Preach under Biſhops, diſpence with the Doxologie, forbear Lecturing, and ſeveral other parts of the Directorian Diſcipline, as *W. M.* has done at the Biſhops order, and yet keep a reſerve for Preſbitery in caſe it come againe in faſhion.

Forthly, I take notice of the Impertinency of *W. M.* his bringing in this ſtory of *Ignatus Loyola*, upon my ſaying ſome Profeſſors in *Aberdeen*, found that ſavour of Life in the *Quakers* Teſtimony, which formerly had ſtired among others who were come to a great decay; now becauſe it was Obvious, I intended by theſe Profeſſors who were come to a decay *W. M.* and ſome others of his Brethren who pretended to be for Independancy in that day, but now were turned with the times, knowing how much it would reflect upon him to harp on this ſtring, he runs away and ſayes, theſe others are *Ignatus Loyola*, and thereupon makes the Comparriſon above mentioned, which Impertinent Digreſſion is abundantly manifeſt.

Fiftly, I take notice of his charging us as rather Reproachers of others then Reproached, becauſe of the plain Language we uſe againſt him and his Brethren, aledging we will not find Chriſt and his Apoſtles uſe the like to ſuch as Profeſſed Chriſtianity, for a reproof of his Ignorance in the Scriptures let him read *Rom.* 16. 18. *Phil.* 3. 2. 1 *Tim.* 1. 19, 20. *ib. chap.* 4. 1, 2, 3, *&c. ib. chap.* 6. *ver.* 3, 4. 2 *Tim.* 2. 17. *Tit.* 1. 10, 11. 2 *Pet.* 2. 1, 2, 3. 1 *Joh.* 2. 18, 19. *&c.* his adding that they ſhew earneſtneſs of deſire that Souls may be ſaved, and willingneſs to promote that deſigne, ſaith nothing except this deſire and willingneſs proceed from the right ground, Papiſts are as zealous in their earneſtneſs and willingneſs as they, and doe no leſs Profeſs ſubjection to the Goſpel, owning Chriſt to be the Meſſiah, and yet *Calvine* ſpared not to term them *impuri Canes*, filthy *Dogs*, Innumerable are the expreſſions of this kind uſed by the zealous *Luther* againſt them.

Sixtly, I take notice of his cautions to me, wherein he chargeth me of Pride, Paſſion, Cenſorſouſneſs, Folly, contrariety to the Word of God, Ignorance, and Indeavouring to Promote the Popiſh Intreſt: but had he truly minded my good in his Cautions, he ſhould have Produced ſome Reaſons to prove me guilty of theſe Crimes, he concludes us Proud for ſeparating from them in Burial Places,

and ſo condemns the French Proteſtants for doing the like from Papiſts: he falſly chargeth us with placing Religion in forbearing Ribands, keeping on the Hat, and ſaying, *Thou* and *Thee*, and thereupon concluds me Ignorant of true Converſion, while his Ignorance of us hath made him thus Calumniatious: he concludes us advancers of the Popiſh Intereſt, becauſe we decry their Miniſtery and Churches, while he borrows this very argument from the Papiſts, who uſed it againſt the firſt Reformers, aledging that their crying down the Church of *Rome*, was a joyning hand with the *Turks*, who did the ſame, though then the firſt Reformers were no *Turks* though they agreed with them in denying the Church of *Rome* neither are we Romaniſts though with thoſe of *Rome* we condemn them, eſpecially conſidering that it is becauſe of their too great Affinity with Papiſts that we do ſo.

Seventhly, I take notice of his confeſſing he never intends to tell the World the Scriptures we uſe, aledging we abuſe them, but if he could have proved we did ſo, it would have tended more to our diſadvantage, and whereas he ſayes he reſolves to Write no more, I confeſs it will be his Wiſdom except he ſpeak to better purpoſe, it is a very apparent ſubterfuge to cover his Reſolutions of not proſecuting farther this Debate, by aledging it will prove endleſs, and compairing us to Scoulds who will have the laſt word, which in reaſon can have no place in this matter, ſeeing being challenged by me of many great Omiſſions, he freely acknowledged he had not, nor did not intend to anſwer me fully, and what he had writ was but ſome Animadverſions which I have indeed found true, having allowed ſome time as he deſired to read them, though it very hardly deſerves to be ſo much regarded.

As to his Epiſtle, if he had as really affected Retirement as he pretends he does, he ſhould have done well to have appeared in Publick with ſome more ſolid ſtuff, he hath herein almoſt onely ſhewed his Ingenuite, in that he acknowledgeth himſelf amongſt the weakeſt of our Oppoſers, comparing his Work but to a ſmall quantity of Water, brought to quench a Houſe one Fire, we have indeed found it of leſs force then many that have come before it, to Smother or Drownd that Truth which God has R vealed among us. In the end of his Epiſtle, he would wilingly have the *Reader* believe he is an upholder of the Proteſtant Intereſt, againſt our endeavours to overthrow it, but to how little purpoſe may, as it occurs be manifeſted.

After,

After he has made an intire Omission of what is particularly directed by me to him in my 8. and 9. pages (as not being able to Vindicate himself) he enters upon the matter of Salutation, undertaking in his first Section, to prove such as are used by gestures, wherein I observe.

First, his most manifest Omission of the first part of mine concerning this thing *Page.* 9. and 10. where I charge him with Dis-ingenuity in wrong Subsuming of our words, which he shufleth over with this general, That after the *Quakers* rate I have Saluted him with Reproach.

Secondly, he having expressed my Argument against their manner of Salutations, *viz.* that being it is the Expression or Signification of our Worship to God, it ought not, nor cannot be given to the creature without Idolatrie, he maketh there unto no direct answer, but instead of one frames a distinction of Worship in Civil and Sacred, the first he sayth may be given to men, but the 2d. to God only, aledging this distinction to be founded on Scripture, *Luke.* 14.10. *Then shalt thou have worship in the presence of them that sit at meat with thee.* Now these words ought to be translated thou shalt have glory, praise or renown, and therefore in the Latine it is, *Et erit tibi gloria*, for so the Greek word *Doxa* Signifies, which *W. M.* will not show me to Signifie *Adoratio*, or Worship: its therefore but a poor Argument that has no better bottom then this manifest mistake of the Translation. For other proof he hath none, neither for his Distinction, nor former Assertion.

Thirdly, I observe his Instancing of the practises of *Abraham*, *Lot*, *Joseph*, *Jacob*, adding that though they be not to be followed in all things, yet in such they may as are not else were Reprehended nor Prohibited. For Answer, let him look unto *Rev.* 22. 9. where the Angel refused it, and seeing I suppose he may have so much Charity for this beloved Disciple, as to Judge he was not Tempted with Idolatry, especially in a season wherein God was Revealing such pretious things unto him: he may observe how this Holy Man was a stranger to this unscriptural distinction, of Civil and Religious Worship.

Fourthly, I observe his endeavours to shift Affinity with Popery, but he hath no way disproved the parity in that wherein I compared them, *viz.* the Papist distingish the Worship they give to God, and that they give to their Images onely in the Intention, and not in

the outward Signification, and ye distingish the Worship ye give to men and that ye give to God, onely in the Intention, and not in the outward Signification, for ye bow and take off your Hats to the worst of men as well as to God, and therefore ye agree, in so far as both has nothing but their Simple Intention, to plead the difference whereunto nothing is answred: He concludes his Section saying, I seem to Justifie *Moses* his doing Obeysauce, to his Father in Law; adding, what is Obeysance but civil Reverence by bowing the Body; this is a fit conclusion to close up such a silly Section, for after he has laboured long in vain, he Concluds, thus begging the thing in question. And if *Moses* bowed himself as I said in my last, that makes nothing against us. His second Section is to prove Salutations by words, which might have been spared until he had proved how and where we deny them, but becauſe he had something to say from Scripture for this, which we deny not, but own as much as himself, he would have it in that he might seem with some credit to bring in his Inference, which is that bowing of the Body and expressing our Affection by words, is agreeable to Scripture: the Latter Part of this concerns not us as being not denied, and for the first, of bowing, it signifies nothing, until it be brought in with some more pressing Premisses, in this Section he acknowledges that takeing of the Hat is without any Scripture Warrant, and from Arguments passes here to Entreaties, Beggingthat it may not be Quarrelled at, but seeing the taking of it off or uncovering of our Heads is that which the Aopstle requires, as a signe of Subjection in our Worship towards God, 1 *Cor.* 11. 4, 7. we Resolve to keep it to Him, and not to give it to man wherein if he will solve our Scruple, according to Scripture we may be the more easily Induced to answer his desire; it is to be Observed that notwith-standing of this, we are not against outward Signification of Honour, though in the end of this Section he fasly would be Insinuating the contrary.

He hath here Subjoyned a third Secttion, which he termeth an Answer to my Objection, and which in Reason should have some relation to Salutations as being under this Head, though indeed it hath none at all, but is a meer Cavil at some of my words upon another Subject, concerning the single *Language*, where Page. 11. I confess with him that the Kingdom of God Consists not in words, adding that it seems Inconsistent with his Principles, seeing the Gospel according to him, is but words, yea the Scripture it self (I mean

that

that which ye have of it, to wit, the Letter) Now this Parenthesis he hath Dis-ingeniously omitted, and thereupon goes about to explaine their meaning of the Scripture and the Gospel, alledging if we be for another, we may justly be accounted Subverters of the Christian Religion, but such shallow Critisims brought in beside the Purpose, whereas other things more Material, are either wholly Omitted or scurvily shifted over, will easily appear to the *Impartial* and *Juditious Reader*.

In his second *Head*, concerning our using Thou and Thee, which is the singular number to one Person, I observe.

First, how he hath given away his own Cause, by confessing that *Luke*. 22. 31. is not understood of one exclusively, of others, and therefore no wonder if Christ used the Plural Number, seeing as *W. M.* confesses he Intended *to speak to all the Apostles*. As for that expression of *Bildads*, *Jobs* Friend (granting both the Transcription and Translation to be true) shall this one Expression overturn the Universal practice of Christ and the whole Saints in Scripture, or let him tell us plainly, whither these words and Practices of *Jobs* Friends which are Recorded, be for to be our Rule so as we ought to Immitate and follow them? especially where they contradict or differ from the Practice of Christ and his Apostles, but to follow this so frequent Practice of the Saints is with *W. M.* to be Proud, knowing nothing but doting about Questions and Strife of Words, for so he misapplyes 1 *Tim.* 6. 4. and to his own Confusion uses it himself, in the end of his *Epistle* to the *Reader*, where he has these Words, *I am thy Servant*, and thereby hath Condemned himself as one of those Ignorant, Proud, Boasters he speaks of, &c.

Secondly, The second thing I observe, that he produceth not one Argument against our Practice in this thing, but his own groundless, yea lying Imaginations and Conjectures, alledging he is of the mind, that if the Translators had not kept to the Rigor of Construction, but Translated *Atach*, and so not *thou* (which is the true Signification) but *you* we had kept our old tone though his disdainful Insinuation of our Ignorance be here apparent, yet experience might have taught him and his Brethren, that even where the Translators have favored them with their escapes, the *Quakers* have both had *Hebrew* and *Greek* enough to find them out, it is also here to be observed how easily *W. M.* can dispence with mistakes, even willful ones, in the Translators when they make for his purpose,

ther by

thereby in effect (for all his pretences of Exalting the Scripture and making it his Rule) he ſignifies his deſire not ſo much to Square his Practices to the Scripture, as by twining it like a Noſe of Wax to make it Squar to them.

He Superſcribeth his third Head, an undertaking to prove that our departing from them is not to be Juſtified by their departing from Papiſts, wherein is to be obſerved his manifeſt Omiſſions, which the *Reader* will ſee by comparing the 12,13,and 14 Pages of my laſt with this his third Head.

Next I Obſerve the weakneſs of his Arguing in what he hath mentioned, wherein he concludes, That becauſe we grant we had a meaſure of Integritie while among them, that therefore it was begot by their Ordinances ſo called, but doth not the ſame recurr in the Caſe of the Primitive Proteſtants, or will he ſay that all of them were void of any meaſure of Integritie, while they were among the Papiſts ? Moreover whereas he Objects, that though God viſited ſome among Papiſts, it was not by Popiſh Traditions, aledging *Luther* had the benefit of the coppy of a *Latin Bible*, whereby he was Inſtructed ; for Anſwer, the ſame recurrs in our Caſe, for whatever advantages *Luther* had either by the uſe of the Bible or otherways, had not we the ſame ?

And therefore in the Third place is to be Obſerved that he hath altered the State of the Queſtion, aledging it to be Incumbent upon me, to prove that they were Converted by the Popiſh Traditions, which is a willful miſtake, for the Queſtion (as may be ſeen in the Pages above-mentioned) was whether God might not countenance us with a regard to that meaſure of Integrity he hath begot in our Hearts, though we were indeed wrong as to our walking with them in their Way ; and this I did Illuſtrate by the example of the Diſciples of *Cornelius* and of *Luther*, who though he came but Gradually to his Diſcoveries, yet was Countenanced in the firſt as well as laſt ſteps, yea notwithſtanding of his erring groſly in the matter of Tranſubſtantion, all this he hath wholly Omitted, cloſing up this Head by endeavouring to draw from my words a reflection upon *P. L.* as if I accounted an Objection coming from him, weak, but it is ill Inferred to conclude *P. L.* from thence a feeble Perſon, for though *P. L.* as well as I, might reckon it weak comparatively in reſpect of others more ſtrong, yet he might Judge it ſtrong enough for ſuch faint Diſputers as *W. M.* or his Brethren at *Aber-*

deen

deen to Anſwer: as that which he reckoned would put the *Quakers* to a great Nonplus, he propoſed in his Dialogue upon this occaſion a Query, *Viz.* Wehther it was ſafe to lean to the Guidance of that Light, which one while ſaies *This is the Way of God walk in it*, another while, *Come out of it*, for it is *Babylon?* To which, beſide the general Anſwer above-mentioned, I ſhew him how eaſily it might be Retorted upon moſt of all the National Miniſtry of *Scotland*, who now are gainſaying, and contradicting that which they had formerly pleaded for as the Cauſe and Work of God, even then as this their Changableneſs cannot be aſcribed to the Scripture, which they pretend to be their Rule, neither will any mans Inſtabillity who pretends to be guided by the Light, prove the Light ought not to be followed, this, becauſe he ſelf might touch him and his Brethren to near therefore he hath wholly Omitted it.

His fourth Head is concerning the Light, containing five Sections, from *Page* 9. to the 25. wherein is to be obſerved.

Firſt, how he has gone from the State of the Queſtion, as it is in his Dialogue *Pag.* 5. where he denies Chriſt to be in the Wicked or Unconverted in any other manner, then as he is in the very Bruits and unſenſible Creatures, but now he grants Chriſt to be in ſuch as to common Operations, and *Page* 22. he ſayes, *That the Light is in all men*, and that *Chriſt is in all men, in ſo far as his Light is in all men*, and thus he overthrowes his chief Argument uſed againſt us; in his Dialogue *Page* the 5. where he ſayes, *That Chriſt is in none but in ſuch with whom He is in Union*, for here he grants Chriſts Light to be in all men, even ſuch as are not in Union with him, adding that *where the Light of Chriſt is, there is Chriſt the Donator of it*, which is all we ſay; ſo then the Controverſie is no more, if Chriſt or his Light be in all men.

But after what manner He is in them, and whether this Light be Saving yea or nay?

And here in the 2d. place I Obſerve his ſhameleſs Diſ-ingenuity and Omiſſion, in ſaying, *It remains for me to prove that this Light in all is Saving*, whereby he would make the *Reader* believe, that I had never offered to prove this, for clearing of which I deſire he may look into *Page* the 23. of my laſt where from *Rom.* 5. 8. *Joh.* 3. 16, 19. *Heb.* 2. *Tit.* 2. 11. *Col.* 1. 23. I did prove that the Univerſal Grace of God given to all men is Saving in its Nature, and in order to Save, and now though no Rules of Strict Debate could require me to proceed further, yet I ſhall go on to Examine the

thereby in effect (for all his pretences of Exalting the Scripture and making it his Rule) he ſignifies his deſire not ſo much to Square his Practices to the Scripture, as by twining it like a Noſe of Wax to make it Squar to them.

He Superſcribeth his third Head, an undertaking to prove that our departing from them is not to be Juſtified by their departing from Papiſts, wherein is to be obſerved his manifeſt Omiſſions, which the *Reader* will ſee by comparing the 12,13,and 14 Pages of my laſt with this his third Head.

Next I Obſerve the weakneſs of his Arguing in what he hath mentioned, wherein he concludes, That becauſe we grant we had a meaſure of Integritie while among them, that therefore it was begot by their Ordinances ſo called, but doth not the ſame recurr in the Caſe of the Primitive Proteſtants, or will he ſay that all of them were void of any meaſure of Integritie, while they were among the Papiſts ? Moreover whereas he Objects, that though God viſited ſome among Papiſts, it was not by Popiſh Traditions, aledging *Luther* had the benefit of the coppy of a *Latin Bible*, whereby he was Inſtructed ; for Anſwer, the ſame recurrs in our Caſe, for whatever advantages *Luther* had either by the uſe of the Bible or otherways, had not we the ſame ?

And therefore in the Third place is to be Obſerved that he hath altered the State of the Queſtion, aledging it to be Incumbent upon me, to prove that they were Converted by the Popiſh Traditions, which is a willful miſtake, for the Queſtion (as may be ſeen in the Pages above-mentioned) was whether God might not countenance us with a regard to that meaſure of Integrity he hath begot in our Hearts, though we were indeed wrong as to our walking with them in their Way ; and this I did Illuſtrate by the example of the Diſciples of *Cornelius* and of *Luther*, who though he came but Gradually to his Diſcoveries, yet was Countenanced in the firſt as well as laſt ſteps, yea notwithſtanding of his erring groſly in the matter of Tranſubſtantion, all this he hath wholly Omitted, cloſing up this Head by endeavouring to draw from my words a reflection upon *P. L.* as if I accounted an Objection coming from him, weak, but it is ill Inferred to conclude *P. L.* from thence a feeble Perſon, for though *P. L.* as well as I, might reckon it weak comparatively in reſpect of others more ſtrong, yet he might Judge it ſtrong enough for ſuch faint Diſputers as *W. M.* or his Brethren at *Aber-*

deen

deen to Answer: as that which he reckoned would put the *Quakers* to a great Nonplus, he proposed in his Dialogue upon this occasion a Query, *Viz.* Whither it was safe to lean to the Guidance of that Light, which one while saies *This is the Way of God walk in it*, another while, *Come out of it*, for it is *Babylon?* To which, beside the general Answer above-mentioned, I shew him how easily it might be Retorted upon most of all the National Ministry of *Scotland*, who now are gainsaying, and contradicting that which they had formerly pleaded for as the Cause and Work of God, even then as this their Changableness cannot be ascribed to the Scripture, which they pretend to be their Rule, neither will any mans Instabillity who pretends to be guided by the Light, prove the Light ought not to be followed, this, because he felt might touch him and his Brethren to near therefore he hath wholly Omitted it.

His fourth Head is concerning the Light, containing five Sections, from *Page* 9. to the 25. wherein is to be observed.

First, how he has gone from the State of the Question, as it is in his Dialogue *Pag.* 5. where he denies Christ to be in the Wicked or Unconverted in any other manner, then as he is in the very Bruits and unsensible Creatures, but now he grants Christ to be in such as to common Operations, and *Page* 22. he sayes, *That the Light is in all men*, and that *Christ is in all men, in so far as his Light is in all men*, and thus he overthrowes his chief Argument used against us; in his Dialogue *Page* the 5. where he sayes, *That Christ is in none but in such with whom He is in Union*, for here he grants Christs Light to be in all men, even such as are not in Union with him, adding that *where the Light of Christ is, there is Christ the Donator of it*, which is all we say; so then the Controversie is no more, if Christ or his Light be in all men.

But after what manner He is in them, and whether this Light be Saving yea or nay?

And here in the 2d. place I Observe his shameless Dis-ingenuity and Omission, in saying, *It remains for me to prove that this Light in all is Saving*, whereby he would make the *Reader* believe, that I had never offered to prove this, for clearing of which I desire he may look into *Page* the 23. of my last where from *Rom.* 5. 8. *Joh.* 3. 16, 19. *Heb.* 2. *Tit.* 2. 11. *Col.* 1. 23. I did prove that the Universal Grace of God given to all men is Saving in its Nature, and in order to Save, and now though no Rules of Strict Debate could require me to proceed further, yet I shall go on to Examine the

Question as he hath now Stated it, *Viz. That such as are not in Union with Christ have not saving Grace*; To prove this he produceth some Scriptures, where such as have Saving Grace and Light are said to be in Union with Christ, which is not in the least denied: But the Question is, whether all that have saving Light are in Union with Christ which he hath not so much as offered to prove, and therefore it is here to be Observed how he hath not so much as mentioned, far less medled with my Arguments, proving Saving Light and Grace to be in men before they be Converted or in Union with Christ, shewing, He must needs be in them before He be in Union with them, that He may work the Faith by which He may be united unto them, seeing, *without Him*, the Scripture saith, *we can do nothing Joh.* 15. 5. as it is more Amply contained in *Page* 15. of my last. *Page* 14. he seems to take some notice of an Example brought by me to shew that Saving Grace Presupposes not Conversion, it is from the Instance of a Plaister, and a Wound; the being healed of a Wound Presupposeth a Plaister, but the Application of the Plaister Presupposeth not the being healed; this he Rejects as not to the Purpose, because as he saith, *who have Saving Grace are in part healed, cured of the Reigning Power of Sin*, but for this he brings no Proof, nor hath not shown us wherein the Comparison Answereth not after the Like Manner. In the same *Page* he addeth, *That the difference betwixt having of Saving Grace, and being in a State of Grace, is but the Figment of the Quakers own Brain*, without giving any cause for it, either from Scripture or Reason, but onely he sayeth so; these are his most Frequent and Inforcing Arguments against us; Of this nature is his arguing *Page* 11. Reckoning it as a great Absurdity flowing from our Doctrine, that it would Import Christ in some measure to be in the *Americans*, because He bears Testimony in them against Iniquity, but to prove this to be absurd, he produceth no Reason, and if we may beleive the *Apostle Paul* he tells us, *That a Manifestation of the Spirit is given every one to profit withall*, 1 *Cor.* 12. 7. So this *Every one* Includes the *Americans*.

The second Absurdity which he seeks to Infer from this hath no better bottom, that then it might be said that Christ is Revealed to Devils, and that we do the *Heathens* small favour in puting them but in the same case with such, for the Revelation of Christ to man before the Day of their Visitation be Expired, and to such after

after they have Sin'd it out, is far different as may appear by *Luk.* 17. Likewiſe *W. M.* hath forgot how eaſily this Arugment may be Retorted upon himſelf, for it is not Queſtioned but Devils have enough of outward knowledg, even ſuch as is gathered from Scripture, and that which *W. M.* accounts the great Privilcdge of Chriſtians, doth it therefore follow that Chriſtians are in no better condition then Devils.

And thus is *Anſwered* another of his profuſe Aſſertions *Page* 12. *That if Pagans have Saving Light, their State ſhould be as good as the State of real Chriſtians*; for it is one thing to have Saving Light, and another to harken to, and receive it, elſe according to his owne Argument the State of Devils ſhould be as good as the State of real Chriſtians.

He adds, *Where Saving Illumination is, there is Saving Faith, becauſe there is a Concatination betwixt theſe Graces of the Spirit.*

Anſ. There is Grace given in order to Save, where Faith doth not follow upon it; which is evident by the Parrable of the Seeds, *Ma.* 13. 3. it was the ſame Seed was ſown in the *Stony* and *Thorny Ground* that was ſown in the *good Ground*, and yet it onely brought forth Fruit there; *the Light enlighteneth every man*; *He came unto His own, and they received Him not*: but it was onely *to as many as received Him* that *He gave Power to become the Sons of God.*

And, wheras he Objecteth, *That where we are deſired to beleive in the Light, it is underſtood of Chriſts Perſon, elſe it would Import a beliefe in a Creature.*

I Anſwer, He that believeth in the Light believeth in Chriſt, for *where the Light of Chriſt is*, as ſaith *W. M.* himſelf (*Page* 22.) *there is Chriſt himſelf.*

In the ſame *Page* he further adds, *That if Pagans have ſaving Light, then there is no Spiritual benefit accrues to Chriſtians by the Scriptures and Goſpel*: But he hath not heard us contra-diſtingiſh this Light from the Goſpel, we ſay expreſly it is the Goſpel, according to *Col.* 1. 23. where the Apoſtle ſayth, *That the Goſpel, whereof he was a Miniſter, was Preached to every Creature*; This Scripture mentioned by me in my laſt he hath wholly Omited, nor is this arguing of his concerning the bad Tendency of our Principle, but a reiterate Clamour of what is already Anſwered in *Page* 16. of my laſt, where I ſhew him we diſtingiſh betwixt things abſolutly need-

 ful

ful and things very profitable, and how they Admit of this Diſtinction themſelves; As alſo how theſe bad Conſequences of Rendring the Goſpel and Preaching uſeleſs, doth far more follow from their Doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination, all which he hath alſo Omitted; Now ſuch are far likelier then we to reprove *David* his Praying for more Underſtanding, and that he might keep the Precepts of God, for being Predeſtinate to Life he could no miſs of it, and how can ſuch but reckon it folly for him to Pray that he might keep the Precepts, whoſe Principles Oblidges them to believe they can never be made able to keep them.

Page 13. To ſay that men are Brutiſh in their Knowledg becauſe they turn their Backs upon the Light, he reckons a *Begging of the Queſtion, as having no proof at all*, whereas it is particularly Intimated 1 *Joh.* 1. 5, 6, 7. where the cauſe of mens Walking in Darkneſs is ſaid to be their not *Walking in the Light*, though it be Paſtors, mentioned in that 10. of *Jer.* 19. that are ſaid to be Brutiſh, yet he cannot be Induced to name them. It is eaſie to prove (though he Inſinnuate the contrary) that what in Scripture is called Darkneſs, hath Saving Light, ſeeing it is expreſly mentioned that *the Light ſhineth in the Darkneſs, but the Darkneſs Comprehended it not.* And this was Saving, being Chriſt who is the Saviour, *Joh.* 1. 5.

Nor doth his ſuppoſed Contradiction follow from this, as if men could be *Spiritually Dead*, and not *Spiritually Dead*, in reſpect they have this in them which is Saving, for though it be in them yet it is not of them, *he that beliveth in me*, ſaith Chriſt, *though he be dead, yet ſhall he live*, *Joh.* 11. 25. If Life be not in them as their Permanent condition, yet they may have ſome touches of it, and the Principle of Life is Permanent even in thoſe that are Spiritually Dead though many times as a Spark covered under the Aſhes; he addeth further, *That according to us, ſuch who are the Children of Darkneſs may be called the Children of Light, becauſe a Child of Light is as much as one in whom there is Saving Light and Grace*, Citing for Proof, *Luk.* 16. 8. the words are, *For the children of this world are wiſer in their generation then the children of Light*, but he offereth from this to Infer, That ſuch who are indeed the Children of Darkneſs, becauſe of their Diſobedience to the Saving Light and Grace of Truth that is in them: he has not offered ſo much as to mention.

Pag. 13. He confeſſeth with me, *That the Light in ſome may be*

Darkneſs

Darkneſs, but ſpeaks not one word of what Light I mention may be ſo; *Page* 17. of mine only adds, *That we will do well to exhort our Diſciples to take heed of our Light, not to it*; But we deſire not People to take heed to our Light or their Light as he terms it, but to the Light wherwith Chriſt-Jeſus hath Enlightened them, and in this there is no danger; he greatly declares his Ignorance, in Alledging our way of bidding People heed the Light within, is not Warranted by Scripture, for *God is light*, 1 *Joh.* 1. 3. is he not *in us*, *Act.* 17. 27, 28. Muſt we not then there take heed unto Him, or is not that Light to be taken heed unto, which *ſhineth in our hearts to give us the knowledg of the glory of God*? 2 *Cor.* 4. 6. And is not the Word of God Light, which the Apoſtle ſayeth expreſly is not far off, neither above us, below us, nor without us, but *nigh, even in* our *mouthes and in* our *hearts*, *Rom.* 10. 8. *Deut.* 30. 14. Moreover *W. M.* himſelf Confeſſeth, *That the Light of Chriſt is in Wicked Men*, and if ſo, let him tell us plainly if men ought not to take heed to the Light of Chriſt where it is, how hath Darkneſs Blinded him in this Matter.

Page 14. He repeats my words falſly, Alledging I ſay, *The Light is Darkneſs to them that Reject it*, inſtead of, is as Darkneſs, For I ſaid plainly, the Light of Chriſt is not, nor cannot be Darkneſs, otherwayes then as the Day of the Lord in Scripture is called Darkneſs, this he hath Omitted.

Page 15. Having ſought but Ineffectually to overturn my Aſſertion, where I ſay, ſome may have Saving Light and Grace, who after a certain manner may be ſaid not to have the Spirit, *Viz.* as not bringing forth the Fruits of it: Averring, *That unleſs I can Prove, that the Spirit calls upon all in Order to Converſion, I cannot conclude that all have the Spirit. Anſ.* As the one is eaſily proved ſo is the other ſafely concluded, theſe are the plain words of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 12. 7. *A manifeſtation of the ſpirit is given to every man to profit withall*: Now it were not profitable unto them, if it did not ſtrive with them in Order to Convert them. That other Scripture *Joh.* 16. 8. he paſſes over, Alledging I ſhould *Prove the World there to be underſtood of all and every one*: though in Reaſon it might ſuffice for anſwer, that there is nothing brought by him to ſhew why the word World here is not taken in its Genuine and Common Acceptation, yet the Apoſtle ſolves this Scruple in the following *verſe*, *of ſin, becauſe they believe not in me*;

Then, if there, all unbelievers be included, is not that all and every one in the World, for of the Saints, there is not here any queſtion.

In his Second Section, *Page* 16. he beginneth with *Omitting my Conceſſion of the Benefit and Advantages that accrue to thoſe that Believe, by the outward Knowledg of Chriſt*, and mentioneth nothing of the State of the Queſtion, which was, *Whether any might be Saved without this outward Knowledg*? and to ſhew that ſome might I gave him the Inſtance of Deaf People and Children, to which he returneth nothing, but takes up the Paper to Prove, *That the Greek Prepoſition* ἐν, *is ſomtimes Tranſlated, among*, which is not denied, yet I ſhall find him twenty to one where it is rendered *in*, and can no wayes be ſaid to be *among*, the Queſtion is, whether in this place 1 *Cor.*2. 2. it be *In* or *Among*? the Reaſon Alledged by him proves it no wayes to be *Among*, to wit, that it would have been the Apoſtles Grief not his Joy, to know that the Light of Truth was born down among them; This was the Apoſtles Joy that the *Corinthians* come to be ſenſible how they had Crucified Chriſt in them, that ſo looking upon, and takeing heed to Him whom they had Peirced, they might come to be Healed by Him.

Page 17. He ſlightly paſſes over that expreſſion of *Paul*, 2 *Cor.*5. 16. where he ſayth, *Henceforth know we Chriſt no more after the fleſh but after the ſpirit*, adduced by me to ſhow that *Paul* prefered a Spiritual Knowledg of Chriſt to all other, as if the Apoſtle were here onely condemning earthly thoughts of Chriſt, as if, as King of *Iſarael*, he ſhould begin a Temporal Kingdom, but for this Expoſition we have onely the bare Authority of his own naked Aſſertion.

Page 18. For want of a true Spiritual Underſtanding Concerning what I mean by the Inward Blood of Chriſt, he bringeth forth his own malitious gueſſings.

The firſt is, That *I ſeem to Incline to Juſtifie that which hath been charged upon ſome of my Brethren*, to wit, *That we are not ſuch Fools, as to hope to be Saved by that Jeſus that died at Jeruſalem*; As he hath no ground to Suſpect ſuch a thing from my words, ſo there was never any ground for ſuch a charge againſt any, owned of that People.

The 2d. is, That *Perhaps I Intend, that Chriſt, as man, dwells in us*, there can none truly charge us with ſuch groſneſs, as to Aſſert the *Manhood*, or *Weſhel*, that walked at *Jeruſalem* is in us, but if any of us have ſaid, that Chriſt as man dwells in us, they have ſaid no more

more then the expreſs words of Scripture, 1 *Pet.* 3. 3, 4. *Let your adorning be the hidden man of the heart, Eph.* 4. 24. *That ye put on the new man*: now what is this *new man* but Chriſt Jeſus, and therfore ſaith the Scripture, *Rom.* 13. 14. *Put on the Lord Jeſus Chriſt.* Gal. 3. 27. *As many as are baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt*; and this is Chriſt which the Apoſtle *travelled* that He might *be formed in* the *Galatians, Gal.* 4. 19. And whereof he Admonniſheth the *Corinthians*, that they ſhould *know* Him *in* them, elſe they were *reprobates*, 2 *Cor.* 13. 5. If it be hard for *W. M.* to take up the meaning of theſe things, let him acknowledge his Ignorance in the Holy Scriptures, whoſe *Language* this is.

In his 3 *Section, Page* 19. He begins by offering to Prove, *our Principles have a tendancy to Introduce Paganiſm*, and to Contradict him, he reckons *an Impertinency*, but his Ridiculous Vanity herein will appear, by looking unto *Page* 24. of my laſt, neither bringeth he any Arguments to Prove this, but ſuch whereby he might conclude the ſame againſt the Apoſtle *Paul*; The *Quakers* ſaith he, *Spakes of a Light within, to which who take heed need no Teacher*, and the Apoſtle ſpeaks of a Knowledg or Light, under the new Covenant, where there is no need of a Teacher, *Heb.* 8. 10, 11. ſo if the tendency of the Apoſtles words be not to Introduce Paganiſme, neither are ours, and becauſe that *W. M.* finds that notwithſtanding of this we diſpiſe not Teaching, but are led even by that Light, to hear and to recieve the Miniſtry of them whom God ſends, he concludes that herein we are *Inconſiſtent*: adding, That *ſome of us have been heard to ſay, That we only Taught to bring People off from other Thachers to mind the Light within, that then they will need none*, which he concludes, *would quickly make them like ſuch among whom the name of Chriſt is not in Remembrance*, but he might as well ſeek to Infer the like hazard, and Contradiction from the plain words of the Apoſtle, 1 *Joh.* 2. 27. *Ye have an anoynting, and ye need not that any man teach you, but as the ſame anoynting teacheth you of all things*, and yet in the mean time was Teaching them.

As for that Story mentioned by him, *Of a certain Dying Man in Aberdeen whom two Quakers preſſed ſo much to mind Chriſt within*, It inferreth nothing for his Purpoſe, for that Dying Perſon had Abundance of the outward Knowledg of Chriſt, and they needed not Preach that to him which he knew, therefore was he ſenſible of the

th. ſeaſonablen.ſs of their Advice, ſaying (as I am certainly In-formed by one of the two) how good a thing would it be for an ill dying man like me, to know that Chriſt within which ye ſpeak of,

He bringeth not any thing of weight in his 4. *Section* as reply to that which is contained in the 22. *Page* of my laſt, where I ſhew we do no ways confound the Light-giver with the Light, or enlightning given : the Reaſon Alledged here is, becauſe we call that Light Jeſus Chriſt wherewith all men are Enlightened, which implyeth no more his Conſequence then that uſual expreſſion, that it is the Sun by which we are outwardly Enlightened, implyes any confounding of the Sun with the Beams,

Whereas in his laſt he ſaid, *There was a certain Light in all men, and that as the Remianders of Gods Image in him ſince the Fall* ; in the end of *Page* 24. he explaines to be *the Light of Reaſon and Underſtanding*, and thereby makes the Reſaon of man all one with Chriſt and the Spirit, which *Page* 10. and 22. he granted to be *in Wicked Men, as to common Opperations.*

After that he laboreth much in this 5 *Section*, to Prove, *That man Retaineth ſome Good ſince the Fall*, he Inſtanceth nothing but the *Soul*, which he ſaith, *is Good and Pretious, and of great Excellency, and Worth, and Retaines a Similitude to the Image of God, as being Spiritual and Immortal*, where it is obſerveable ; That he grants the Souls of Wicked and Unconverted men to be of great Worth and Excellency, and yet he denies the Works of the Pure Spirit of God to be of any Worth or Excellency, and that becauſe the Soul has a ſhare in them : if ſo be the Souls of Wicked Men are conform'd to the Image of God, becauſe they are Spiritual and Immortal, then are Divels alſo conform to the Image of God, for they are alſo Spiritual and Immortal in the ſame ſence that the Souls of Wicked Men are.

Laſtly, I deſire the *Reader* may here Obſerve, how he hath entirly Omited that part of *Page* 23. of mine where I ſhew how and in what ſence the Light is to be underſtood or called the Light of Nature, and of what Nature, therein clearing us from the Aſpertion of Pelaganiſme, by which Omiſſion it may appear how willing theſe men are to Calumniate us, and apt to paſs by that which tends to our Vindication.

Page 25. *Head* 5. *Sect.* 1. He alledgeth, *We vilifie the Scriptures*, and

and that becauſe we confeſs, *That the end of our meeting is not to read them, but to wait on God*, adding, that therefore *we make an oppoſition betwixt Reading the Scriptures, and waiting on God*; But as this concluſion hath no Proof, ſo it is moſt Inconſequential, as if nothing could be diſtingiſhed except it were Oppoſite: according to which he might Argue, that becauſe Preaching and Praying are not all one, therefore they are Oppoſite: that ſome have been Countenanced of God in Reading the Scriptures is not denied by us, and therefore the bringing of it forth againſt us, is wholly Impertinent.

And whereas he avers, *That Reading of the Scripture is the meanes of having the Word of God to dwell richly in us*, alluding to *Coll.* 3. 16. he ſhould have firſt proved the Word there mentioned to be the Scripture, before he had been ſo haſty to draw his Concluſion.

His Alledging ſome paſſages, *where Chriſt and others ſpoke upon ſome words of Scripture*, ſaith nothing to the purpoſe, for as I confeſſed it was ſometimes uſed by them, ſo I told him it was alſo frequent among us; but the Queſtion is, whether their ſetled Cuſtom of ſpeaking upon a Text be according to Scripture? and thereupon I ſhew him how Chriſt and his Apoſtles did Preach without it, as Chriſt, *Mat.* 5. and in many other places: And *Paul* to the *Athenians*, but this of *Paul* mentioned by me in my laſt he hath left unanſwered.

And in *Anſwer* to 1 *Cor.* 14. 29, 30, 31. *For ye may all prophecy one by one*, &c. He ſaith, *This will not conduce to keep up the Succeſſive talking of Quakers*, Alledging it to be *Riſtricted to the Prophets*, which he ſayes, *It will be hard to prove our Preachers to be.* Adding, *That it maketh not againſt their Way, becauſe Miniſters ſpeak among them two or three.* Here though in relation to us he Reſtricts this place to the Prophets, yet in relation to himſelf he doth it not, elſe he muſt prove their Miniſters, that ſo ſpeak, to be Prophets, as he deſires me to do our Preachers; Now this he cannot, ſince he ſayes Peremptorily, *Page 97. That ſuch a thing is ceaſed*, and therefore this may ſhew how he twinds and wreſts the Scripture, to make it Anſwer his Corrupt ends, it is a manifeſt ſhift to avert the ſtrength of this place, where the Order of the Church which is quite contrary to theirs, is expreſly mentioned. To run to the matter of Womens Speaking, thereby to make a Digreſſion to a new Debate, which hath been largly defended by us, and paticularly by *Margret*

gret. Fell. in a Book never yet answered, and as to the place Alledged we have often shown how it cannot be understood, in a Ridged Litteral sence, else it would contradict the same Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 11 5. where he Proposeth to Women the Method and Manner of their behaviour, in their publick Preaching and Praying; the Promise was, that the Daughters as well as the Sons should Prophesie, *Joel.* 2. 28 *Act.* 2. 17.

As a 2d. Reason of our villifying the Scripture, he adds, and that by way of derision, *They will not have the Scripture called their Masters Letter (No Forsooth) their Masters Letter is writ in their Hearts*, &c. *Ans.* Here his Malice hath not only led him Foolishly to Deride us, but the Apostle, yea God himself: for the Law of God is our Masters Letter, and this is in our Hearts if we be under the New Covenant, *Hib.* 8. 10. *I will put my law in their minds, and write them in their hearts*, and *ver.* 11. *they shall not need every man to teach their neighbour, for they shall all know me*, &c. His Argument taken from *Christs writing to the seven Churches of Asia*, makes nothing against us, except he will be so Ridiculous to aver, that these Churches had no Rule nor Knowledg of their Masters will, before they received that Writting, which if they had, it was not there onely, and this was that Incumbent to be proved, for which that example was brought, for the Testimony of Christ through his Servants, whether by Word or Writ is Dearly Owned by us, as hath often been declared.

With the like Impudence he Concluds, *That we bend our strength to Evacuate the Authority of the Scriptures, and confirm Negligent Atheists, in their Contemptuous slighting of them*, because we Speak of walking, or doing our Work by the Immediate Councel of God; But he might as well babble against the Beloved Disciple 1 *Joh.* 2. 24. *Ye have received an anointing and ye need not that any man should teach you*, and yet was then teaching them himself without Contradiction, as for that Scripture, *Joh.* 12. 24, 48. which he desires us to read, we find not how in the least they strike against our Principle, for as it is without doubt to us, that the words which Christ spake will stand in Judgment against him and his Brethren, because while in words they pretend to Exalt it, both in Principle and Practice they Villifie and deny it.

As a 3d. Reason he Alledges, *We Prefer our Silent Waiting to the Reading of Scriptures, as if we must first come to this, ere we can know*

know the Scripture aright, adding *that this waiting is defined by us, to be a silent posture of the Heart, without thinking good or evil.*

Answ. These thoughts which we say ought to be excluded from waiting, are mans own thoughts, not such as the Spirit of God furnisheth him with, and it is great Ignorance to say that without this we can use the Scriptures aright, seeing the things of God knoweth no man save the Spirit of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. 11. As for his own Imaginations which he Subjoines concerning our waiting they signifie nothing, because Alledged without any proof, we deny not but that Faith Hope and Charity is exercised in waiting, yet not without such thoughts as proceed from the Spirit of God and whereas he finds we clear our selves of this Calumnie, of being Vilifiers of the Scripture, by showing how much it is our desire to try Doctrines by them: he alledgeth, We have *herein been suspected of Jugling*, the proof is, *R. Farmer saith so.* but *R. Farmers* saying and *W. M's.* saying is all one in this matter, neither of them are to be trusted without proof: Now the Reason because we say that the Scriptures are not the Saints Rule of knowing God and Living to him, but this is just to beg the thing in Question.

That Story mentioned by him of a *Quakers telling a certain Woman in Aberdeen, that she might as well read a Latin Book as the Bible*, doth no waies prove that we are against trying of Doctrins by the Scripture, seeing the *Quaker* he speaks of, might have had good reason to look upon that supposed Religious Woman, as one alienated from that Spiritual Key of *David* which can alone truly open the Scriptures, and so might well tell her, she would do well first to come to that, else her Reading might be so far from profiting her, that she might come to Wrest them to her own Destruction, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16.

Sect. 2. *Page* 30. he begins with acknowledging, *That something may be accounted the Declaration of ones Mind, which is not his word*, though *Page* 12. of his Dialouge, he *could not but finile at it as Irrational.*

To prove the Scriptures to be truly and properly called the Word of God he subjoyneth, *That the Precepts of the Scripture were uttered and spoke of God*, but in *Answ.* to this I shew him *Pag.* 26. of my last, that the Properties peculiar to the Word cannot be spoken of the Scripture, but of the Inward and Living Word, to which he replys nothing, onely tells *there is a twofould, Word a*

Co-essential

gret. Fell. in a Book never yet answered, and as to the place Alledged we have often shown how it cannot be understood, in a Ridged Litteral sence, else it would contradict the same Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 11 5. where he Proposeth to Women the Method and Manner of their behaviour, in their publick Preaching and Praying; the Promise was, that the Daughters as well as the Sons should Prophesie, *Joel.* 2. 28 *Act.* 2. 17.

As a 2d. Reason of our villifying the Scripture, he adds, and that by way of derision, *They will not have the Scripture called their Masters Letter (No Forsooth) their Masters Letter is writ in their Hearts*, &c. *Ans.* Here his Malice hath not only led him Foolishly to Deride us, but the Apostle, yea God himself: for the Law of God is our Masters Letter, and this is in our Hearts if we be under the New Covenant, *Heb.* 8. 10. *I will put my law in their minds, and write them in their hearts*, and *ver.* 11. *they shall not need every man to teach their neighbour, for they shall all know me*, &c. His Argument taken from *Christs writing to the seven Churches of Asia*, makes nothing against us, except he will be so Ridiculous to aver, that these Churches had no Rule nor Knowledg of their Masters will, before they received that Writting, which if they had, it was not there onely, and this was that Incumbent to be proved, for which that example was brought, for the Testimony of Christ through his Servants, whether by Word or Writ is Dearly Owned by us, as hath often been declared.

With the like Impudence he Concluds, *That we bend our strength to Evacuate the Authority of the Scriptures, and confirm Negligent Atheists, in their Contemptuous slighting of them*, because we Speak of walking, or doing our Work by the Immediate Councel of God; But he might as well babble against the Beloved Disciple 1 *Joh.* 2. 24. *Ye have received an anointing and ye need not that any man should teach you*, and yet was then teaching them himself without Contradiction, as for that Scripture, *Joh.* 12. 24, 48. which he desires us to read, we find not how in the least they strike against our Principle, for as it is without doubt to us, that the words which Christ spake will stand in Judgment against him and his Brethren, because while in words they pretend to Exalt it, both in Principle and Practice they Villifie and deny it.

As a 3d. Reason he Alledges, *We Prefer our Silent Waiting to the Reading of Scriptures, as if we must first come to this, ere we can know*

know the Scripture aright, adding *that this waiting is defined by us, to be a ſilent poſture of the Heart, without thinking good or evil.*

Anſw. Theſe thoughts which we ſay ought to be excluded from waiting, are mans own thoughts, not ſuch as the Spirit of God furniſheth him with, and it is great Ignorance to ſay that without this we can uſe the Scriptures aright, ſeeing the things of God knoweth no man ſave the Spirit of God, 1 *Cor.* 2. 11. As for his own Imaginations which he Subjoines concerning our waiting they ſignifie nothing, becauſe Alledged without any proof, we deny not but that Faith Hope and Charity is exerciſed in waiting, yet not without ſuch thoughts as proceed from the Spirit of God and whereas he finds we clear our ſelves of this Calumnie, of being Vilifiers of the Scripture, by ſhowing how much it is our deſire to try Doctrines by them: he alledgeth, We have *herein been ſuſpected of Jugling*, the proof is, *R. Farmer ſaith ſo.* but *R. Farmers* ſaying and *W. M's.* ſaying is all one in this matter, neither of them are to be truſted without proof: Now the Reaſon becauſe we ſay that the Scriptures are not the Saints Rule of knowing God and Living to him, but this is juſt to beg the thing in Queſtion.

That Story mentioned by him of a *Quakers telling a certain Woman in Aberdeen, that ſhe might as well read a Lattin Book as the Bible*, doth no waies prove that we are againſt trying of Doctrins by the Scripture, ſeeing the *Quaker* he ſpeaks of, might have had good reaſon to look upon that ſuppoſed Religious Woman, as one alienated from that Spiritual Key of *David* which can alone truly open the Scriptures, and ſo might well tell her, ſhe would do well firſt to come to that, elſe her Reading might be ſo far from profiting her, that ſhe might come to Wreſt them to her own Deſtruction, 2 *Pet.* 3. 16.

Sect. 2. *Page* 30. he begins with acknowledging, *That ſomething may be accounted the Declaration of ones Mind, which is not his word*, though *Page* 12. of his Dialouge, he *could not but ſmile at it as Irrational.*

To prove the Scriptures to be truly and properly called the Word of God he ſubjoyneth, *That the Precepts of the Scripture were uttered and ſpoke of God*, but in *Anſw.* to this I ſhew him *Pag.* 26. of my laſt, that the Properties peculiar to the Word cannot be ſpoken of the Scripture, but of the Inward and Living Word, to which he replys nothing, onely tells *there is a twofould, Word a*

Co-eſſential

Co-eſſentiall, Co-eternal Word, and a Spiritual Word; the Temporal expreſſed Word, or the Word written in time; but ſeeing he pretends to be pleading for the Scripture, he ſhould have uſed the Language of it, and not ſuch ſtrange Anteſcriptural expreſſions which are not to be found in all the Bible: Where doth he read of a Spiritual Temporal expreſſed Word? a part of my Argument ſhewing that theſe Scriptures, *Hoſ.* 1. 1. *Joel.* 1. 1 *Eſa.* 38. 4. are underſtood of that Word from which the Scriptures are given forth; he hath but mentioned, not anſwered; for I told him, *Pag.* 26. of my laſt, that where it is ſaid, *The Spirit of God came upon ſuch a one, or to ſuch a one*, that therefore the Scripture is the Spirit, and ſo as do the *Socinians*, call the writings of the Prophets and Apoſtles, *the Spirit*, denying the neceſſity of any other Spirit, this he hath wholly Omited: and indeed he ſeemes prety much to incline to the *Socinians* in this matter, for he ſayes, *That the Scripture is the Sword of the Spirit, and that becauſe Chriſt in his conflict with Satan ſaid, it was written*; but had this been Chriſts onely Sword, we muſt conclude the Devil to have had the ſame, for he ſaid alſo, *it is written*; and according to this Doctrine who hath a Bible in his pocket, wanteth not the Sword of the Spirit, which ſavoureth of that Popiſh foppery, *that the ſign of the Croſs puts away Devils*; but experience teacheth us both theſe Opinions to be alike Ridiculous.

Upon this occaſion in his Dialouge, *Page* 13. he aſſerted, *That it is all one to ſay the Scripture ſaith, and God ſaith*; and whereas, in Anſwer to this, I told him, that they might be ſaid to be one becauſe of their Agreement, yet were no more one then the Sun Beam and the Shadow is one though they agree together, becauſe he knew not what to reply to this, he mentions a part of theſe words of mine, and Subjoyns by way of Anſwer to them, that they tend to advance humane Writings, and equal them with the Scripture, when they agree with what God ſayeth: which as it is a manifeſt ſhift, and no reply, ſo it is a notable Impertinency, to ſay, there is any hazard of advancing ſuch Writings as truly agree with what God ſayeth, for upon what other account are the Scriptures to be eſteemed?

Page. 32. to prove that word mentioned *Mark.* 7. which he Phancies are ſaid to be made void, is not the Living Word, but the outward Precept of the Scripture, he ſayes, *It is plainly held forth to be ſo without any further Probation.*

He

He addeth, *Page* 34. *That it ſeems we think they ſet up the Scriptures as an Idoll, inſtead of that from which they come; aſking, If we did ever hear them call it the Eternal Son of God, that Saviour who died,* &c.

Anſwer. Though we have not heard you term the Scripture, yet it is not without Reaſon, we ſay, ye ſet them up in Chriſts ſtead; for I have a Letter under one of the preſent National Teachers hand, wherein he ſayes, *The Scriptures are the alone means of Salvation; yea, the alone Way Truth and Life, and that none can be ſaved without them.*

And I have heard another call the Greek Teſtament, *The onely foundation.* Now being theſe are the peculiar Properties of Chriſt, have we not reaſon to ſay, that ſuch as aſcribe them to the Scriptures, puts the Scriptures in Chriſts ſtead, though *W. M.* be pleaſed to term it unworthy dealing.

Sect. 2 *Pag.* 35. he ſayes, *It is not dificult to prove that the Law and Teſtimony mentioned, Deut.* 8. 20. *was not an inward Law*: The reaſon Alledged is, *Becauſe the Prophet oppoſes what is written as no Light, if it agree not to the Law and Teſtimony*; But what then, doth this prove the Teſtimony here not to be inward? He adds, *That let People pretend what they will to a Law within, if it agree not with the Scripture Word, there is no Light in them; and that the outward Law gets the name of the Teſtimony*; but granting him all this, it doth not in the leaſt follow, that the Law and Teſtimony; there mentioned was not inward; It is more Obſerveably ſtrange here then in any other place, with what ſhameleſs confidence, he aſſerts his own bare Aſſertions inſtead of Arguments.

After the like manner without anſwering a word of what I infer, *Pag.* 27. of mine againſt him and his Brethren from *Joh.* 7. 49.

He concludes, *That Scripture fits us better then them, becauſe of our known raſh cenſuring*; upon which ſuppoſition of his own, he condemnes us as like to Phariſees without more adoe: ſtill alſo by way of reply to me, he ſayes, *It is not probable that Chriſt checked the Lawyer in ſaying*, How readeſt thou? *Luk.* 10. 26. not offering to add any further probation, and as for what he ſubjoyneth, *Pag.* 7 *That Chriſt uſed the Scripture about Divorcement, and in the matter of the Sabbath*; it doth no wayes prove them to be the only Rule, for, as is ſaid, we are willing to try Doctrins by them.

Pag. 37. He ſayeth, *It is falſe to affirm that the Divine Authority of the Scriptures, cannot be prov'd other-wayes then by the Spirits inward Teſtimony*: adding, *There are other Arguments whereby it can ſolidly and convincingly be proved*; and for this he inſtanceth one which he ſayes, *is excellently improved by R. Baxter*; what then, becauſe *W. M.* thinks that Argument of *R. Baxter* will prove the Scriptures Authority without the Spirit, muſt we therefore be of the ſame mind? I doubt very much if *R. Baxter* think ſo much himſelf; Now *W. M.* his deceit is very Remarkable, in quoteing ſome words of *John Calvin*, where he ſayes, *If he were to deal with Arguments, he could produce many to prove the Laws came from God, for that I never Imagined theſe Arguments could convincingly, prove the Scriptures Authority without the Spirit*, (which is the thing in debate) it appears in the very following words, *Lib. Inſt.* 1. *Cap.* 7. *Sect.* 4. But if we will well look to our Conſciences, that they be not troubled with doubts, and ſtick not at every ſcruple, it is requiſite the Perſwaſion whereof we have ſpoken, be taken higher then humane Judgment or Conjecture, *Viz.* the ſecret Teſtimony of the Holy Spirit. And a little after in direct oppoſition, to wit his words, he adds, *This word ſhall not obtain Faith in the Hearts of men if it be not Sealed by the Inward Teſtimony of the Spirit*; *It is neceſſary then*, ſaith he, *that the Saints Spirit which ſpake by the mouth of the Prophets, enter in our Hearts, and touch them Livingly, to perſwade us, that the Prophets have faithfully delivered that which was Commanded them from on high*; and a little after, *This then is a perſwaſion which requires no reaſons*: And again, *This is a Perſwaſion which cannot be Begotten but by a heavenly Revelation.*

And in the beginning of the next Chapter he adds, *If we have not this certainly higher, and more firme then all humane Judgment, in vain is the Authority of the Scriptures proved by Arguments.* This doth abundantly ſhew how contrary *W. M.* is to *Calvin* in this matter; and not to him alone, but to the whole Reformed Churches of *France*, who in their confeſſion of Faith agreed upon by the firſt National Synod they ever had at *Paris*, Anno, 1559. ſay thus, Art: 4. *We know theſe Books to be Canonique, not ſo much by the common conſent of the Church, as by the Inward Teſtimony and perſwaſion of the Holy Spirit*; and whereas he adviſeth me to read *Calvin* his 6th. *Chap.* but that it would prove to long a Digreſſion,

I could eaſily ſhew, that we are no ſuch contemners of the Scripture as thoſe he there ſpeaks to: And what if he contradict the Truth which we, and himſelf elſe where acknowledges, I make uſe of his Teſtimony againſt *W. M.* and his Brethren, even as he did the Teſtimony of *Auguſtin*, *Gregory*, and others of the Fathers, againſt thoſe of *Rome*, whom nevertheleſs he ſpared not to reject ſometimes. Read *Inſt. lib.* 1. *cap.* 11. *Sect.* 5 *lib. cap. Sect.* 4. and in many other places, thus alſo is added that which he adds about *Paſſur*, whoſe Tranſlation he ſayes, *We follow in one thing, but not in another*, for we are not bound to follow him further then he follows the Truth; Nor doth *W. M.* here produce any argument to prove that theſe words, *Joh.* 5. 39. ſhould be, *Search the ſcriptures*, and not ye *Search the ſcriptures*, but his own bare aſſertion, adding *That Chriſt did not check them, when he ſaith in them, ye think to have eternal life*, whereas the very following words clearly Import a reproof, *Ye will not come to me that ye might have life*; He ſays not, ſeek for Life in the Scriptures, ye do well to think to find it there, but thus, *Ye think to have eternal life in the ſcriptures, but will not come to me that ye might have life.*

He ends this Section, asking, *Seeing I grant the Scriptures are profitable for doctrine, correction, reproof, &c. Why I deny them to be a perfect Rule?* but I never denyed them, and I told him alſo, they were thus profitable, not to every man, but to the man of God, *i e.* he that's led by the Spirit of God; Now to this he replys no hing, onely tells me, *The man of God is moſt commonly underſtood of the Miniſters of Chriſt Jeſus*, which though I ſhould grant him, what he either can or would Infer from it, againſt my Argument he hath left unmentioned.

Sect. 3. *Pag.* 40. He alledgeth, *The voice and Teſtimony of the Father, which Chriſt ſpeaks of to the Jewes, not to have been inward, deſiring the reader to look to the place*: and thereupon he cites *Joh* 5. 36. where Chriſt ſpeaks of his Miracles as a greater witneſs then that of *John*, but his deceit is here abundantly manifeſt, for the place mentioned by me was, 1 *Joh* 5. 10. *For this is the witneſs of God, which he teſtified of his Son, he that believeth in the Son of God, hath the witneſs in himſelf*; Now, this he hath wholly omited, and mentioned another in the ſtead of it, which makes nothing to the purpoſe, I deny not but the Miracles were a greater witneſs then that of *John*; but then, will it therefore follow that the inward

Teſtimony

Teſtimony of the Father is not greater alſo ; this was the matter in queſtion. After the like manner he concludeth the voice ſpoken of, *John* 5. 37. *Is not inward, but outward*, citing for Proof, *Mat.* 3. 27. 2 *Pet.* 1. 17, 18. the one is the voice heard at Chriſts being Baptized, the other at his being Transfigured : But what way he ſeeks to Infer from thence, that the Voice of the Father here ſpoken of by Chriſt to the *Jewes*, was not inward but outward, he hath left unmentioned.

Likewiſe, the Expoſition he adds upon this place, as if Chriſt were onely here reproving the Ignorance of the *Jewes*, whoſe Predeceſſors had heard ſo much of God, it would be the better received, that it had ſome other bottom then his own meer aſſertion.

Page 14. He confeſſeth, *That where we are deſired to try the Spirits, there is no mention of trying them by the Scripture* : And to my Queſtion, asking if there be any ſurer way of trying of Spirits, then by the Spirit of God ? he returneth no reply, but another Queſtion; *Viz.*

Whether there be any ſurer way then that for which the Bereans were commended ?

I *Anſwer*, *Yes*, by the Spirit, *Peter* could never have diſcerned *Ananias* and *Saphira* by the Scripture, and yet did it by the Spirit ; To ſay (as he does) *That this was a matter of Fact and not of Doctrine, and that it was extraordinary*, is a meer ſilly ſhift, for it was onely by the Spirit of God ; which is ſo ordinary to Chriſtians, that none can be truly one without it, *Rom.* 8. 9. *If any man have not the Spirit of Chriſt, he is none of his* ; And if this Spirit can diſcern the ſecret hypocriſie of the Heart, in matters of Fact, far more the Errors, and miſtake of the Underſtanding, in matters of Judgment, which all grant to be more Obvious.

And though I never aver'd, that *John* excluded all external Rules, by pointing to the anointing, ſo his aſſertion to ſay : *That the anointing directeth us to the Law, and to the Teſtimony, as ſuppoſing it to be outward*, is but to beg the thing in queſtion already refuted.

Page 43. As he affirmeth, *That mans being deluded proceeds not from the Scripture, but their own blindneſs*, ſo he acknowledges, *That falling in Deluſion, proceeds not from the Spirit, but from the tricks and deceits of Satan*, and thereby he hath clearly confeſſed, what is aſſerted by me *Page* 30. and not anſwered : And whereas he adds,

That

That leaning to the Spirit, and forsakeing the Scripture, provokes God to give men up to strong delusions, which he Illustrateth by the example of one *J. Gilpen once a Quaker, who by harkening to a voice within, was put upon Mischievous and Detestable Practices.*

I *Answ.* He hath not proved that we forsake the Scripture, nor will one mans being deceived, by harkening to a voice within, prove the Spirit not to be a certain Rule, more then as himself ackowledges, *The Pharisees having the Scripture in such high esteem, and accounting them their Rule*, will prove their delution proceeded from them; that Story of *Gilpens* was largly answered about 5. years agoe by *E. B.* and *C. A.* who have laid open his Deceit and Wickedness, neither can any of these Rediculous Pranks, (granting the matter to be true) which he pretended to doe by a voice within, while appearing to be among us, prove the insufficiency of that Light we Preach, or the hazard of following it, more then his Beastly Drunkness and open Prophanity, naturally known in the Garison of *Carlile*, where he was a Souldier, proves he was led by the Scripture, which it is like he then pretended, was his Rule unto these wicked practices, which were the best fruits of that Repentance, *W. M.* seems so much to congratulate in him: Such filthy Dross whom God purgeth out from among us, are fittest persons to be Proselited by him and his Brethren: and truly we are well rid of them, and can heartily spare such unto them; *They went out from us, but they were not of us, for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us: but they went out that they might be made manifest that they were not all of us.* 1 *Joh.* 2. 16.

Pag. 43. He sayes, *That though the Scripture be sufficient for discovering of Delusions, and ending of differences*, in genere objecti, *yet the Spirit is necessary*, in genere causæ affectivæ: Now this necessity of the Spirit he saith himself, *Is that we may be right discerners, for removeing our natural depravedness*; and now granting the Scripture were sufficient in this manner, will it therefore follow that the Spirit within is not the Rule; which was the thing to prove in this Section, in so far as he acknowledges this necessity of the Spirits work, he hath yeilded to the Truth; yet it is observable, how in contradiction to the Truth he overturns it all again.

Pag. 47. 48. Where he expresly pleads, *For Preaching upon, and using the Scriptures, without the joynt Concurrance of the Spirit*; alledging, I *have no ground to say they ought not so to do*, then consider

conſider, firſt he ſaid, *The Spirit was neecſſary to Remove the depravednes of our nature that we might be diſcerners*, but now he ſayes, *we ought to uſe the Scripture without the Spirit, though our nature be depraved, yea though we be in no capacity to make a right diſcerning*, and here he hath notably manifeſted his affinity with the *Jeſuits*, *Arminians*, *Socinians*, *Pelagians*, and *Semipelagians*, in ſaying, *How many cold hearts have been Rubbed and Chaffed unto Spiritual heat, by reading and talking of the Scripture*; For is not this to ſet nature a work, and to grant a capacity in man to beget Spiritual heat without the joynt Concurrence of the Spirit; and this is alltogether agreeable to that known Maxim of the *Semipelagians*, *facienti quod in ſe eſt, deus non denegat gratiam*, *God will not deny him Grace that doth what in him lies.* And hereby the Intelligent Reader may perceive, how much nearer a kin our Adverſaries are to theſe Errors then we, notwithſtanding they ſo falſly and frequently brand us with them, in their Pulpits and elswhere, as alſo that it is meerely conſtraint when they are hardly put to it, that they now and then, and that in contradiction to themſelves, let a word or two drop concerning a neceſſary Work of the Spirit.

Sect. 4. Pag. 45. He alledgeth, *There is no convincing People by this Rule of the Spirit within, becauſe each way may pretend to the guidence of his Spirit, and ſo both remain obſtinate*: adding, *That according to them the Scripture is the rule which lieth patent to both parties; and though it do not actually convince the ſtuborn, yet there is enough in it to ſatiſfie any Inquiſitive Adverſary.*

Anſw. And is not that Spirit ſufficen to ſatiſfie any Inquiſitive Adverſary, that's willing to be undeceived, which ſearcheth all things, even the deep things of God: There is no inconvenience can be preſſed from making the Spirit a Rule or Guide, but the ſame recurs by making the Scripture one; for is it not laid claim unto by Perſons quite different in Judgment, yea both ſometimes to one *verſe*, and will have it ſpeak oppoſite to the other, if it be ſaid, that Scripture being compared explaines it ſelf; has not ſuch as have ſo compared, been found unceſſantly to jangle even in their comparing of it. And this *W. M.* cannot deny, but this hath been becauſe, one or both parties hath been eſtranged from the true Teſtimony of the Spirit: What is then the Ultimate Recorſe that can onely reſolve all doubts even concerning the meaning of the Scripture, but the certain Teſtimony of the Spirit? for if the

Scriptures

Scriptures be onely certain becauſe they came from the Spirit of God; then the Teſtimony of the Spirit muſt be more certain then they, according to the received *Maxim* of the Schools, *Propter quod unumquodque eſt, tale id ipſum magis eſt tale, That which makes a thing certain must be more certain then it*; and this arguing againſt the certainty of the Spirit, checks not onely at the certainty of the Saints Faith now, from the Light within, and the aſſurance of knowledg, but at the Faith and Knowledg, which all the Saints and holy Prophets had; not onely before the Scripture was writ, but even in their writing of them. We are inno greater hazard to be deceived now, then they were then, therefore the Apoſtle notably reproves ſuch Pratlers againſt this certainty, 1 *Joh.* 4. 6. *We are of God, he that knoweth God heareth us, he that is not of God heareth not us: hereby know we the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of error.*

Page. 48. He asks, *Why I complain for his improving Eſa.* 59. 21. But mentions not one word of that part of *Pag.* 32. of mine, wherein I ſhew him how this Scripture made againſt him, as holding forth Gods putting words in mens mouthes which they deny, as a thing ceaſed; This the Reader by looking to the place may obſerve, that the Lord there Promiſes his Spirit and Word ſhall continue to direct his People, is not denied.

In his Dialogue, *Pag.* 16. He ſayes, *That the Scriptures cannot be ſaid to be a dead Letter, becauſe they are called killing*, and whereas I told him, *Pag.* 31. of my anſwer, That as dead things do kill if fed upon, ſo if men feed upon the Letter of the Scripture, without the Spirit which is the Life they will kill: he ſhifts a reply to this, telling me, *The Scripture is called killing, as being the Miniſtration of the Law, which threatens Death againſt the ſinner*; What then doth it therefore follow that they are not dead, and deadly to ſuch as feed upon them, without the Spirit which giveth Life; it is an apparent Mallitious Paſſion, to add, *That the drinking in of the Lifeleſs Poyſonous Opinions, of the Quakers, will prove hurtfull to the Soul*; ſeeing he bringeth not the leaſt ſhadow of proof for it. I obſerve, that he Intitleth this Section, *The Quakers way Ineffectual to convince an Oppoſer*; And yet how is it, that he and his Brethren are ſo affraid that it ſpread, and are daily ſo much crying out and clamouring againſt it as dangerous, intreating and beſeeching People to beware of us, and comparing our words and writings to Poyſon, as that which is ſo ready to gain ground; I ſay how

comes it that they are ſo preſſing in their importunate, and often reiterate Pulpit-exhortations, to the Magiſtrates, to Suppreſs, Impriſon us, and break up our Meetings, as ſuch against whom their labours will prove altogether fruitleſs and ineffectual, if not aſſiſted by the external Sword.

Sect. 5. Pag. 49. He undertakes to compare us with Papiſts, as having learned our Language about Scripture from them, but herein he hath notably manifeſted, both his ſelf contradiction and Ignorance; He alledgeth, *We agree with Papiſts, in that we ſay if the deluſion be ſtrong in the Heart, it will twine the Scriptures to make them ſeem for it; and in that we ſay they are dead, and occaſion Sects, and Janglings, (wherunto we allwayes add, becauſe the Spirit is wanting;)* And yet in this ſence he fully grants it himſef, *Pag. 43.* ſaying, *It is granted, that deluded Souls do wreſt the Scriptures,* &c. He concluds us one with Papiſts, for ſaying there was a rule before the Scriptures, and yet grants it himſelf, *Page. 46.* in confeſſing the Scripture was not a Rule to ſuch Saints as lived before it was writ, ſuch then had ſome Rule before the Scriptures; thus far as to his ſelf contradictions: As to his Ignorance can there be any thing more ſottiſh, to compare us with Papiſt for our prefe.ring and calling the light within, as that which onely makes the outward diſpenſation of the Goſpel profitable, and for our ſaying, that the Spirit is both our Teacher and our Coppy, according to which if we walk, we may profit without going forth for a coppy, ſeeing it is known, none to be more enemies to theſe Doctrines then Papiſts; and if we deny the Scripture to be the principal and compleat rule of faith, that proves us no wayes to agree with Papiſts: except we all agreed with them concerning what is the rule of faith, wherein we differ wider from Papiſts, then our oppoſers; therefore that ſentence of *Tertulian Viz. That Chriſt is allwayes Crucified, betwixt two Thieves,* is Impertinently objected by *W. M.* againſt us, and if the Lord will it may in due time be made appear to publick view that it far better ſuits our adverſaries.

He looks upon it as a great abſurdity, *Pag. 51. To deny the more ſure word of prophecie, mentioned, 2 Pet. 1. 19. to be the Scripture:* Alledging, *I ſhould have confuted the Apoſtle who expounds it ſo, verſ. 20.* But before he had been ſo peremptory in his concluſion, he ſhould have firſt proved that the Apoſtle mentions theſe words, by way of expoſition to the former, ſeeing he thinks himſelf ſo ſecure

here,

here why did he omit to answer that part of *Page* 31. of mine, where I told him, That seeing the Scriptures have all their sureness from the Spirit, they cannot be more sure then it; for to say that Scripture is more sure as to us, being a standing Record, then a Transient voice from heaven which may be mistaken or forgotten, answers nothing; seeing that more sure word we speak of, is not a Transient voice, but that Word of God which is allwayes with us, *nigh us, in our hearts*, if we be willing to hear it and regard it: and can far less be either forgotten or mistaken then Scripture, for it speaks plain, home, and neer, even to such sometimes who would willingly both mistake and forget it, *Heb.* 4.12.

Though I could freely refer his *6 Head*, concerning *Justification*, to be compared by the Juditious Reader, with that which is contained from *Page* 32. of my last, to *Pag.* 44. As being a confused mass, which needs no further refutation, yet because he makes a great noise, here I shall subjoyn these few observations a little to unvail him in this matter.

And in His *first Section* from *Pag.* 52. to 58. I observe, how hastily he passes over the Charges laid by me to his door, *Pag.* 23. which because he cannot clear himself of, therefore he hath not leasure to answer.

Secondly, I observe, how after he repeats my words, *Of our sence of Justification*, which the *Reader* may see at length, *Pag.* 33. of my first, he can say nothing against them, but onely I seem to Insinuate, they had no need of inward Righteousness; It appears his guilt has made him so jealous in this thing, as if I had been reproaching him, where I onely gave an account of my own belief; his accusing or suspecting me of Fraud or Cheating, signifies nothing, except he produce some reason for it.

In order to discover this, he proposeth, *What may be the sence of the word Justifie in Scripture, as it imports the sinners Justification before God*; which he determinatly affirms, *Onely to be a pronouncing or accounting a man Righteous, and not a making him so*; citing for proof, *Pro.* 17.15. Though Justifie in some places may be so understood, as in this, which indeed, hath no relation to the sinners Justification before God; yet where it hath such a relation, it may be understood otherwayes, *Viz.* a makeing a man just, as in that notable expression of the Apostle *Paul*, 1 *Cor.* 6 11. *But ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified*, &c. For if Justifie here were not

to make men Righteous, but onely to impute them or account them ſo, then Waſhing, and Sanctifying, were not real but only imputative alſo, and at this rate the *Corinthians* could not be eſteemed truly waſhed of their ſins, which the Apoſtle mentions in the former verſe, ſuch as Stealing, Drunkneſs, Covetouſneſs, but onely thought or imputed ſo, and this were to make the Chriſtian Religion a cloak for all wickedneſs, as if men were not by it truly cleanſed of theſe evils, but on the contrary foſtered in them: In theſe places alſo, Juſtification was taken in relation to inward righteouſneſs, *Rom.* 8. 30. *Whom he called, them he alſo juſtified, and whom he juſtified, them he alſo glorified*, *Rev.* 22. 11. *Qui juſtus eſt, juſtificetur adhuc*, for ſo the *Greek* and *Latine* hath it, which being rightly Tranſlated, is, *He that is juſt let him be juſtified ſtil!*; It is to be obſerved, that I deny not, but the word Juſtifie, is ſometimes taken in Scripture for pronouncing men juſt, though he falſly ſeems to inſinuate the contrary.

Thirdly, I obſerve his alledging, *That our ſpeaking of being juſtified by Chriſt revealed in us, is a falling in with the Popiſh ſence of Juſtification*, adding, *That our more full agreement with them, doth appear, in that wherein* I *ſay we differ from them*, but here his ſhameleſs diſingenuity is manifeſt, in that he hath not anſwered at all *Page* 34. 35. of my laſt, as to that wherein I ſhew our diſagreement with Papiſts; And how this manner of Juſtification by the indwelling of Chriſt is denyed by them, and particularly diſputed againſt by *Bellarmine*: For to prove our ſuppoſed Affinity with Papiſts, and imagined oppoſition to Proteſtants, he formeth a Queſtion, *Viz.*

What is that, which cauſeth a man to ſtand pardoned and ſo juſt before God, and for which he is pronounced Righteous? adding, *That the Papiſts have herein, recourſe to infuſed Righteouſneſs, but Proteſtants to the imputed Rihgteouſneſs of Chriſt, namely the Satisfaction and Merit of His death.*

But here is to be obſerved, how confuſedly he hath tumbled things together that ought to be diſtinguiſhed, whereby he may the more ſecurely lurk under them, though Originally the cauſe of both be the infinite Love of God, in which Chriſt was given,

who

who offered up himself a most sweet and satisfactory Sacrifice, as the Ransom, the Atonement, the Propitiation for our sins; But as to our being Justified, it is by Christ and his Spirit, as he comes in our hearts truly and really to make us Righteous; which because we are thus made, therefore are we accounted so of him, as the Apostle plainly intimats in the 1 *Cor.* 6. 11. That it is by the Spirit of God we are Justified, nor is this any conivance with Papists, who as is abovesaid deny Justification in this manner; and it is but to befool children and simple ignorants, that he covers himself so much with the general term of Protestants, as if our Doctrine were generally denied by all such, seeing many and that very Famous Protestants, have been of our mind, and have eagerly pleaded for this real Righteousness, as to Justification against his sence of it; particularly, *Osiander* one of the first and most Renowned Reformers of *Germany*, who not without ground, avered *Luther* to be of this Judgment.

And *Melancton*, in the Apology of the *Augustinian Confession*, saith, *To be Justified in Scripture, not onely signifieth to be pronounced Just, but to be made Just or Regenerate*; *Johannes, Brentius*, and *Cheminitus*, admit also of the same signification; so *Epinus*, and *Bucenus* include, in Justification, not onely forgiveness of sins, but Regeneration, and Righteousness, wrought in us: And *Borheus, sive Cellanus*, a Germane Protestant, and professor of Theology at *Basil*; *In the Imputation*, saith he, *by which Christ is ascribed, and imputed to believers for Righteousness, both the merit of His Blood, and the holy Spirit given unto us by the vertue of his merits, is equally included*; *and thus* saith he, *we shall consider wholly Christ proposed to us unto Salvation, and not a part of him*; *lib. in Gen. Pag.* 162. again, *Pag.* 169. he saith, *In our Justification Christ is considered, who Breatheth and Liveth in us*; *Viz. Put on by us through his Spirit.* And *Pag.* 181. he saith, *The form of our Justification is the Divine Righteousness, whereby we are formed Just, and Good*; *this is Jesus Christ, who is esteemed our Righteousness, partly by the forgiveness of sins, partly by the Restauration and Renovation to Integrity, lost by the fall of the first* Adam; *He being put on by us, as the new and heavenly* Adam, *of which the Apostle*, Ye have put on Christ, *put him on I say, as a form*; *i. e. the Wisdom Righteousness and Life of God.* And, *Pareus de, just. Cont. Bellar. lib. 2. cap. 7. Pag.* 469. *We*, saith he, *neither ever spoke nor thought*

thought the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt to be imputed to us, that by it we were and might be named formally Righteous, as we have oft now ſhewed; for ſurely that ſhould no leſs ſight with reaſon, then if one quite abſolved in Judgment, ſhould ſay, he were formally Righteous by the mercy of the Judge. Theſe are the plain and poſitive expreſſions of ſeveral famous Proteſtants; though *W. M.* reckons *G. Keith's* words, mentioned by him *Page* 55. *as Popiſh*, which are nothing different from theſe: And of late, *R. Baxter* (whom *W. M. Page* 37. termes, *A Juditious Servant of God*) holdeth this Doctrine throughout, in his Book termed, *Aphoriſms of Juſtification*; who *Page* 89. ſaith, *That ſome Ignorant Wretches, gnaſh their teeth at this Doctrine, as if it were flat Popery; not underſtanding the nature of the Righteouſneſs, of the new Covenant; which is all out of Chriſt in our ſelves, though wrought by the power of the Spirit of Chriſt. Page* 195. He ſaith, *How this differeth from the Papiſt he need not tell any Scollar who have read their writings*; hereby the Inteligent Reader may obſerve how ridiculous, if not malitious, *W. M.* is, in making ſuch a noiſe; as if we were in this matter, either going with Papiſts or oppoſing Proteſtants.

In his *ſecond, Section, Pag.* 58. Though he would be making a great huſtle, of our ſpeaking *of Juſtification by works*, yet in the very entry, he cannot deny but he is for it; *According to the true ſence and meaning of the Spirit*: And therefore it remains to prove, that ours is not ſo.

His alledging from ſome words of *Samuel Fiſher, Where he ſpeaks of works having merit*, ſayeth nothing, for the queſtion recurs concerning the ſignification of the word *Merit*, which we uſe in a qualified ſence; for we ſay that works are no other wayes Meritorious, then as they are rewarded, *Merit* and reward being relative terms, as I told him, in my laſt, to which he returneth no anſwer: And thus is ſolved, *Sam. Fiſhers* uſing of that argument, mentioned by him, *Page* 60 (to whom he fooliſhly ſuppoſes, I cannot reconcile my ſelf, without being of a higher ſtrain then for a reward of *Merit*) to wit, That as Condemnation, is the reward of evil works; ſo Eternal Salvation, and conſequently Juſtification, is the reward of good works. Now, *Merit* in a quallified ſence, doth not import an abſolute deſert, according to ſtrict Juſtice, as on our part, but a ſutableneſs, agreableneſs, or congruity, according to theſe Scriptures, Mat. 3. 8. *Bring forth fruits worthy of repen-*

tance

rance, the Greek word is ἄξιος, which ſignifieth *Meritorious*, or Worthy, and the ſame Greek word is uſed in theſe other Scriptures, 1 *Theſ.* 2. 12. *Walk worthy of God*, 2 *Theſ.* 1. 5. *That ye may be counted Worthy of the Kingdom of God.* And thus *R. Baxter* ſpeaketh of *Merit*, in the Book above mentioned, *Page* 90. in a large ſence, ſaith he, *As promiſe is an obligation, and the thing promiſed is called debt, ſo the performers of the conditions are called Worthy, and their performance* Merit; *Though properly, it is all of Grace, and not of debt.*

Moreover, whereas *Auguſtine*, *Bernard*, and others of the Fathers, uſes the word *Merit*, in this qualified ſence, *W. M.* and his Brethren can give it the right hand, but where we uſe it; notwithſtanding, we tell them the ſimplicity of our meaning, we muſt be upbraided with Popery.

It is here, obſerveable, How he turns it to my reproach, *That I ſeem to draw neer, in the leaſt, to any of the moderate ſort of Papiſts*; And yet as to things, wherein I charged him of affinity with them, he returneth no ſolid anſwer, but ſayes, *I muſt not be credited*; Yea, he plainly, not onely drawes neer, but fully acknowledges his agreement with them. Saying, *They hold ſome things common with the Orthodox.*

His *third*, and *fourth Section*, containeth not any thing of a ſolid reply, to that which is writ from *Page* 36. to 44. of my laſt, which the Reader by comparing them may eaſily obſerve, He begins alledging, *That Rom.* 3. 28. *Gal.* 2. 19. *muſt exclude all works, even the Works of Chriſt in us*; *And that becauſe, the Apoſtle muſt be ſuppoſed, to exclude either evil or good Works, not evil, therefore good*; *And conſequently, the Works of Chriſt in us.* But as I told him in my laſt, ſome Works may be good materially, which proceeding not from the Spirit of God, but mans own Spirit, are therefore excluded; And thus the caſe of *Abraham* doth not anſwer, who though a godly man, was capable ſometimes, to have done Works from his own Spirit.

It is here obſerveable, How he ſeeks to ſhift, that which I inforce upon him, from *Tit.* 3. 5. Alledging, *He mentioned it in oppoſition to Juſtification by Works, as the meritorious cauſe thereof*; But of this, there was not one word: Where he cites in his Dialogue, *Pag.* 20. nor doth he anſwer any thing, for that which I infer from this Scripture, ſhowing *Page* 37. of my laſt, to which I refer the Reader

der, he having wholly omitted it, that by this Scripture, where the Apoſtle ſayes, *According to his mercy he ſaved us, by the waſhing of regeneration*, the Apoſtle includes good works as to Juſtification; now all this he ſhuffles over, as Inſulting Triumphing words; And yet notwith-ſtanding, he himſelf inſults here, as though he had found us guilty of Popery, though what we ſay in this matter, be no other then what is clearly aſſerted, by theſe famous Proteſtants above mentioned; and more particularly by *R. Baxter*, in his Book aforeſaid, from *Pag.* 185. to the end, where he ſayes, *That we are Juſtified by Works, in the ſame kind of cauſality as by Faith, Viz. as* cauſæ ſine quibus non, *conditions, or quallifications of the new Covenant, requiſite on our part, in order to Juſtification*; ſhowing, How the Apoſtle *Paul*, in the places above mentioned, excludes onely the Works of the Law from Juſtification, and never at all the Works of the Goſpel as they are the conditions of the new Covenant; and there he refutes *W. M's.* expoſition upon *Iſa.* 2. 12. *As if our Juſtification, were onely Juſtified by Works, or we declared Juſt by them before men*, And ſeeing *W. M.* hath declared he hath ſo good an eſteem of *R. Baxter* I refer him to read, how he is refuted by him, as being to large to be here inſerted.

Pag. 65. 66. To overturn that which is ſaid by me, concerning the *Faith, Knowledg*, and *Obedience of the Saints, Pag.* 38. 39. of mine; But his Impertinency will be more then manifeſt, if the Reader do but look unto the place, for I ſhew him how faith was not alwayes attended with doubting, by the example of *Abraham*; And therefore his example of the Light and the Air is fooliſh, for faith and doubt, are not onely diſtinct but oppoſite, and not mixt as is the Air and Light; and a little Gold may be perfect, and unmixed with droſs, ſo may little faith be perfect in its meaſure without doubting; And though the knowledge and obedience of the Saints, be not ſuch as there can nothing be added unto, or anſwerable to the infinite Love of God, yet, that doth not prove them in what they are to be defined.

His *Anſwer*, to that Scripture brought by me, 1 *Joh.* 3. 9. *He that's born of God ſinneth not*, is moſt Impious and Antichriſtian, as if the words imported onely, *He maketh not a trade of ſinning*, for accordingly he might argue, that where it is ſaid, *Commit no Adultery, do not Steal, Murder*, &c. it is onely underſtood, that we ought not to make a trade of theſe ſins, but yet might practice them now and then.

Page 67. He addeth, *That* (as the Prophet Esa. 64. 6. saith) *not all our righteousnes which is of thy working in us, is as filthy rages; so neither as we say, all our righteousnes, which we, even the best of Saints can perform, of and from themselves, are as filthy rags*, from thence infering; That because of this general term *all*, even the Righteousnes of Christ in us, ought to be accounted *as filthy rags*, but for this he bringeth no proof; and as the Prophet saith *All*, so he saith *Our*, which implyes it to be different from the Righteousnes of Christ: As he proceeds in the same *Page*, he is highly confused, first he sayes, *It ought not to make us ashamed, that our Righteousnes* (*understanding that which Christ works in us*) *are as filthy rags*, and then he saith, *That they are a special Ornament to the Soul, making it, in Beauty to resemble God*: And again, to get ground he sayth, *That as so, Imperfection cleaveth to the very Grace of God here*, absolute blasphemy; Can there be any thing more confused and contradictory then to say, That which is defiled, *as filthy rags, is a special Ornament to the Soul, or makes it in Beauty to resemble God.*

In *Answer*, to *Pag.* 40. 41. He replies nothing, only grants, *That the Saints in heaven are cleansed but not on earth*, which instead of reply, is a meer begging the thing in question. He closeth up this Section to prove, *The Righteousnes of the Saints is defiled*, with his old instance, of clean water passing thorow an unclean pipe, alledging it, *By me not to be weakned*, though I do no wayes answer what I said against it *Page* 41. to wit, That Spiritual Water, is not like outward Water, which an unclean pipe can defile, but is like the Fire, and Light, which though it touch unclean things cannot be defiled, because every thing of the Spirit is undefilable as is the Spirit; And whereas he desires me, *To instruct him of an outward Water, which is not capable of defilement*, I refer him to a more diligent study in his Physicks, of which it seemes he is very ignorant, and that he may not have reason to think this a shift, let him read the *Essayes* of the *Virtuosi* in *France*; And those termed *the Royal Society* at *London*, and he will find such a thing both practicable and practiced.

He begins his *fourth Section Pag.* 70. with a gross piece of disingenuity, in mentioning a part of my words, where I say, Justification is taken for making a man righteous, and then it is all one with Sanctification, thereupon alledging, *I confound Justification,*

and Sanctification; whereas he omits the very former ſentence wherein I ſay, Juſtification is alſo taken, as Gods Judging men unto Eternal Life, but this deceit, the Reader may at more length obſerve, by looking to *Page* 41. of my laſt; And in that he adds, *Men are not made Righteous by an inward Righteouſneſs*, he doth greatly declare his ignorance, for if men can really be made Righteous, without Righteouſneſs be really in them, by that which is wholly in another, then they might as well be really made holy without any inward holyneſs, and this were rather to confound that which God diſtinguiſheth, and to alter the Scripture ſence of the word *Juſtifie*: He alledgeth, *That Phil.* 3. 8. *diſclaimes the Righteouſneſs of Chriſt*, but brings no proof for it, and as to his Comentaries, he muſt advert, he is not in the Pulpit, and muſt bring nothing here without probation: And whereas I ſhew, That this argument from the 2 *Cor.* 5. 12. is moſt abſurd and impious, becauſe accordingly it would follow, that as Chriſt was made ſin for us, who of himſelf knew no ſin, no not in the leaſt, ſo we may be made righteous before God, though we have no Holineſs, no Faith, no good thing wrought in us, he terms this an impudent wreſting of his words, alledging, *That the ſtrength of of his argument lieth in that*; *As our ſins are inherent in us, and imputed to Chriſt, ſo his Righteouſneſs is inherent in him and imputed to us*, but he doth not ſhow me, how this in the leaſt ſolves the conſequence above deduced, which followeth as before; And as for that excellent gloſs, which he ſayes, *A certaine one put on theſe words*, it would appear the more ſuch, that it had ſome ſhadow of proof for it, it is with a fools conſequence that he calleth; This which I ſhew was deduceable from his words, my Inference, charging me with it, as if I were, *Impious and abſurd, to imagin that God ſhould except one as Righteous in his ſight, and yet his Perſon remain abhored as an unholy ſinner*; did I ever aſſert any ſuch thing, or can there be any thing more ridiculous, then for him to dream I imagine that to be true, which I reprove in him as falſe, abſurd and impious, in the like manner he condemns me as impious, for inſinuateing, that they are againſt inward holineſs ſeeing as he ſayes, *They profeſs that without holineſs none can ſee God*, it is true, they ſay ſo ſometimes, and therein often contradict themſelves, as is above remarked, yet ſeeing they look not upon it, as any wayes neceſſary to Juſtification, and terms the beſt of it, but as *filthy rags*, their ſeeming to plead

for

for it doth but bewray their ignorance and confusion: Now whereas to prove that works of the pure Spirit of God, are not all as *filthy rags*, I did inquire of him, if the Apostles did sin in writing the Scriptures?

He *Answers*, *First*, *That it was a singular extraordinary thing, and so supposeth they might have been preserved.*

Secondly, He demands, *What were the hazard to aver, that they were wanting in that which they ought to have had?*

As to the *First*, it is but an evasion without proof, what singular and extraordinary thing is in some of *Pauls Epistles*, which are concerning his outward occasions; and if the last be admitted as I find he fears, I find he will be forced to do, it overturns his example of clean water passing through an unclean pipe, or else he must acknowledg the Scriptures are defiled, because they come through the Apostles, whom his Principles obliges him to believe, not to have been perfect.

In his *Seventh Head*, *Pag.* 74. He summarily passes over, and that by large omissions, what is contained in the 44, 45, 46, and 47 *Pages* of my last, which if the Reader do but review, he may easily discover that silly shift which he useth; To wit, that he means to be thrifty of his Paper, in answering the *Quakers* self-advancing words, seeing he is such a good manager of his Paper, he might have bestowed some of that he has lavished, in the large Capital Titles of his many *Heads* and *Sections*, to show the Impertinency or vanity of my words, and then he might have been the better credited, after he has omited my answer, wherein I clear the *Quakers* from that calumny, of exalting themselves; showing they do therein no more then all other professions have done, and do do.

He adds, with a great exclamation, *Oh, it is intollerable Pride to villifie all the Saints and Servants of God in the World, and to shut them out from being of Christs stock!* a strange inference, according to which we must conclude, that because *Luke* called *Theophilus* Κρατιστε, or most good, that therefore there was none good but he, *W. M.* will do well to go back to the *Grammar Schoole*, and there learn the natures of degrees of Comparison, and when he has instructed himself there, he may next look over his *Logicks*, and there he will find that *Majus & minus, non variat speciem*, i.e. less or more of a thing changeth not its nature or kind; I suppose he will not deny but there are several sorts of Christians, who though they do

all profess Christianity, yet are more or less pure in their Doctrine, Discipline, or Practice, is it not upon this score, that the *Calvenist* hath seperated from the *Lutheran*, and the *Presbyter* from the *Episcopalian*; Certainly *W. M.* himself lookt upon *Independancy*, as more pure then *Presbytery*, when he seperated with the *Congregationists* at *Aberdeen*, and Communicated apart with them; and yet his practice now showeth that he doth not exclude, even, *Episcopacy* from Christs stock, though his *Independant* and *Presbyterian* Brethren, do look upon it, if not within the walls, at least, in the Suburbs of *Rome*. Neither is this Clamany against us as if we trusted in our selves that we were Righteous, and despised others, (for so he misapplieth the parable, *Luk.* 18. 9.) any other then the same which those of *Rome* used against the first Reformers, to wit, they were Proud, and Boasters, as if all the World had been in darkness before them; Or as if they were Wiser then all the Doctors, and Fathers of the Church, seeking to inovate the order thereof, which had been confirmed, by the Unanimous consent of so many Generations.

It is observable, How here, as in other places, he is so ready to lay claim to the Protestant Churches, alledging, *That in disdain I call them their flocks*, which is utterly fals, I speak of their flocks as inferiour to the People called *Quakers*, in point of mortification; But that I intended thereby the Protestant Churches, is but his groundless conjecture; I let him understand I look not upon their flocks as deserving the name of Protestants, and that because of their shameless degenerating from such as were first so called, among whom as I freely confess, there were several of a heavenly, and spiritual conversation; So I look upon *W. M.* and his Brethrens laying claim unto them, but as the *Jewes*, boasting of *Abraham* as their Father. After the same disingenious manner he concludes, *That the Persons he spoke of in his Dialouge, as having such notable Enjoyments of, and Communion with God, were from Quakerism*, &c. But answers not a word of *Page* 46. of mine, where I shew, that those Professors agreed with us, in many of these things wherein, *W. M.* And his Brethren oppose us, but particularly, in the matter of the Spirits immediate teaching, it is then likly they would have been far from us, especially considering, that several who have received and owned the *Quakers* Testimony at *Aberdeen*, are such who were the most Intimate Friends, even in Spiritual Matters

Matters with theſe Profeſſors, whereas *W. M.* and ſome other of his Brethren, who walked alſo among them that are not come to own the *Quakers*, are degenerated and gone back unto that which all of them acknowledged to be Anti-chriſtian; for which their groſs backſliding and degenerating, (to uſe rightly his own miſaplied inſtance) it is without doubt theſe Profeſſors, would have lookt upon him and his Brethren as Monſtrous, and abhored their treacherous, Time-ſerving, Turnings with the greateſt deteſtation.

Head 8. *Page* 77. He avers us to be guilty of equivocating, and that becauſe we ſay we are for *Baptiſm*, and yet are againſt *Baptiſm* with water; The reaſon alledged is, becauſe *Baptiſm*, is commonly underſtood of *Baptiſm* with water, and therefore to underſtand it otherwayes, he concluds, is to ſpeak lies in hipocriſie, *&c.* But this concluſion, is founded upon a ſuppoſition denyed by us, and therefore it is a meer begging of the thing in queſtion, for ſince we deny that common, becauſe corrupt, acceptation of the word *Baptiſm* and gives it the true one (as in its place ſhall be ſhown) therefore we are not obliged to put another meaning upon it, then we are perſwaded it ought to be underſtood; But this calumny againſt us, as equivocaters or liars, *W. M.* hath alſo borrowed from the Papiſt, who uſed to upbraid the Proteſtans, for ſaying they were for, or of the Catholick Church, becauſe the Papiſt will have the Church of *Rome* only to be the Catholick Church, but the Proteſtants denied her to be ſo, and therefore would not call her ſo, even as we deny the ſprinkling with water to be *Baptiſm*, and therefore will not account it that which it is not, but reſerve the name; to that which truly is the thing, according to the Scriptures.

The like may be ſaid of the Lords Supper, I mean that which is ſo called.

Head 9. *Pag.* 78. Becauſe he can produce nothing againſt my conceſſion of ſinging of Pſalms, he ſuſpects I mean not honeſtly, and that becauſe none of his ſpies whom he ſends to our Meetings, have had occaſion to be witneſſes to our practice in this thing, which ſayes juſt nothing: Why might not, *W. M.* his intelligencers fail him in this as well as his brothers *David Lial* did, in telling him, *That there was not one word ſpoken among the Quakers at their Meeting, the* 3 *of the* 11 *Month* 1670. Which though a manifeſt untruth in matter of fact, he ſpared not to bring forth in his Chaire

of

of verity, upbraiding the Magiſtrats as if God had miraculouſly ſent an Officer, to ſtop or Impede our Worſhip, though they had refuſed to do it. The ſtory of *I. Nailor*, which he ſubjoynes, any may obſerve to be meerly brought in to render us odious, and fill up the paper, though indeed it tends no wayes to our diſadvantage, he being in that thing, and at that time, altogether denied by us, and hath ſince in print freely acknowledged his fall in that hour of Temptation, of whoſe ſincere Repentance, and true return to the fellowſhip of the Truth, we have had many evident tokens, whereas were we to retort, we could find a thouſand to one among your Church members, many whereof are daily knit up for Thieving, Murder, &c. and ſome burnt for Witchcraft, without the leaſt ſence of true Repentance.

For to vindicate their manner of ſinging with a mixt Multitude, he alledgeth, *That all men, yea all the Earth are called to praiſe God*; and though all be called to do ſo, yet there are things abſolutly needful previous to this duty, and granting their want of praiſing to be ſinful, yet the way to prevent this evil is to come firſt to that, wherein they may be in a capacity to do it acceptably, therefore ſaith the Apoſtle, *I will ſing with the ſpirit, and* I *will ſing with the underſtanding alſo*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 15. where he ſpeaks of ſinging he alwayes ſubjoynes the inſtrument, wherewith it is altogether needful that we take it, and that the ſame may be urged in the caſe of Praying without any abſurdity, in its place ſhall be ſhown; He ſayes, *It is no more a lie to uſe words in ſinging which ſute not our condition, ſuch as* (I water my Couch with tears; My heart is not haughty) *then to read them*; but there is a great difference betwixt reading and ſinging, in reading we but relate the conditions and actions of others, as wholly diſtinct and extrinſick from our ſelves, but in ſinging we do really adreſs our ſelves to God as in Prayer, and it is no leſs a lie to ſing to God words that ſute not our condition then to pray with them. The Saints in Scripture uſed ſuch expreſſions as did ſute the preſent poſture of their hearts, in their Spiritual Songs. See, *Luk.* 1. 46. and 2. 29. he ſhall not find me in the whole Bible, where they borrowed or ſealed the expreſſions of others experience, which no wayes ſuted their own condition, this is a meer humane invention which has its original from the *Romiſh Veſpers* and *Mattins*, and from no other foundation.

Head, 10. Concerning Baptiſm, *Page* 81. He alledgeth, *That John*

John diſtingiſheth not the matter of his Baptiſm from Chriſt, but only his work; but his proof for this overthrowes himſelf, for ſince, as he ſayes truly, *John could onely adminiſter Baptiſm with water, but Chriſt with the Spirit*; this ſheweth them to have differed in the matter, for without doubt *John* could adminiſter the matter of his own Baptiſm, and whereas I told him they differed in the end becauſe the one pointed to the other, even as the ſhadow pointed to the ſubſtance, in ſtead of replying to this, he tells me, *That the Scripture ſpeaking of Johns Baptiſm, calls it the Baptiſm of Repentance*, intimating its end was to ſignifie and Seal remiſſion of ſins, which likewiſe is the end of Chriſts Baptiſm; As this no-wayes anſwers my argument, ſo it makes nothing to the purpoſe, for it is one thing to ſignifie Repentance, and remiſſion of ſins, and far another to know, and poſſeſs it, which is the end and conſtant fruit of Chriſts Baptiſm, *Gal.* 3.27. *As many of you* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *as have been baptized unto Chriſt, have put on Chriſt*: And therefore it may be obſerved, that without any proof he concludes, that *Johns* Baptiſm and Chriſts agree both in the matter and end.

Pag. 82. As a reply to *Act.* 19. 2 cited by me to ſhow that they differed in ſubſtance, he ſayeth, *The meaning is not that they were ignorant of the Perſon of the holy Ghoſt*, contrary to the very expreſs Scripture words, *We have not ſo much as heard if there be any holy ghoſt*. He ſaith further, *That the Apoſtles did not anew baptize ſuch Perſons, that had been baptized with the Baptiſm of* John, in direct contradiction to the Scripture words, ver. 5. *When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jeſus, And when Paul had laid his hands upon them, the holy Ghoſt came upon them*, now *vers* 3. ſheweth; That they were baptized unto *Johns* Baptiſm before, ſo let him clear himſelf here of giving the Scripture the lie if he can.

Section, 2. *Pag.* 83. To prove the perpetuity of water Baptiſm he begins with that often anſwered argument of the Apoſtles practice, adding, *That though Chriſt*, Mat. 28. *doth not mention Baptiſm with water, ſo neither with the Spirit*, alledging, *That thus the one may be excluded as well as the other.*

Anſw. Seeing Chriſt commanded them to baptize, it cannot be denied but it was with his own Baptiſm, which is that of the Spirit; He adds, *That if Baptiſm of the Spirit were intended, it would infer a needleſs Tautology in the command of Chriſt, as being all one with*

with theſe words; *Go Teach.*

Anſw. Teaching, and making men holy and Righteous, are different things, for he will grant that he and his Brethren have been teaching People, theſe ſeveral years, and yet he will have much adoe to prove all their Church-members are really made Righteous and Holy, why then doth he account theſe two one, reckoning it a Tautology to expreſs them ſeverally; A little after he inſinuates, and that moſt falſly, that I deny *Peters* commanding *Cornelius* to be baptized, concealing my expreſs words, *Page* 50. which are theſe, And though it be ſaid, *ver.* 28. that he commanded them to be baptized in the name of Chriſt, yet it holds forth no command from Chriſt, onely the thing being agreed upon that it might be done, he bid do it, this he hath left un-anſwered; And whereas he adds, *That doing things in the name of Chriſt is as much as his command*, he bringeth no proof for giving, but not granting, it did hold ſo, *Mat.* 18. 20. in the caſe of meeting, that will not prove it is allways ſo taken. To evict my objection, againſt any determinate Commiſſion the Apoſtles had of Baptizing with water, becauſe *Paul* ſaid, he was not ſent to Baptize but to Preach, he returns, *That if he had no Commiſſion, he would have Baptized none, but he Baptized ſome, which would have been of ſelf-will.*

Anſw. He might object the ſame as to Circumciſion, that becauſe the Apoſtle Circumciſed *Timothy*, therefore he had a Commiſſion for it, he would not have done it of ſelf-will; His inference from, *Hoſ. 6. 6. For I deſire mercy and not ſacrifice*, as if from thence, *Paul* were ſent principally to Baptize and not to Preach, as God there required onely principally Mercy, not excluding Sacrifice, is moſt ridiculous and inconſequential, nor is there any reaſon produced to ſhow the party, the Apoſtles were Commiſſioned to Baptize as principally as to Preach, go Preach and Baptize are knit together; but the queſtion is, Whether this be a Baptiſm with water which remains yet unproven? And therefore his additions to the Scripture is no wayes Juſtified, as if *Paul* had been ſent to Baptize with water, but not principally.

Pag. 86. He undertaketh to prove that, *Mat.* 28. 19. is meant of water-Baptiſm and not of the Spirits-Baptiſm, the reaſon alledged there, *Becauſe the Baptiſm there mentioned is the action of the Apoſtles, and that to Baptize with the Spirit is peculiar to Chriſt*, adding, *That it would be a confounding of the Duty commanded, with the Promiſe*

Promiſe of the bleſſing annexed to it; from thence he concludes, *That Baptiſm with water is to continue to the end of the world.*

Anſw. The reaſons prove nothing, and might militate the ſame way againſt Teaching, which is alſo there commanded as the action of the Apoſtles, and though it be peculiar to Chriſt to teach by the Spirit, that did not hinder them to do it; further, the very Apoſtles by laying on of hands did adminiſter the holy Spirit, and ſo Baptize with the Spirit, *Act.* 10. 44. 19. 6. And this is no confounding of the Promiſe with the duty, for therein was the Promiſe and Bleſſing fullfiled that they did it effectually, and therefore from hence he had no ground to conclude the perpetuity of water-Baptiſm; Moreover whereas he cited in his Dialogue, *Pag.* 39. *Act.* 2. 38. 1 *Pet.* 3 21. *Act.* 22 16. *Eph.* 5. 26. *Gal.* 3. 27. as holding forth the excellent uſes of water-Baptiſm, though I ſhew him *Pag.* 5. of mine, that theſe Scriptures are onely aplicable to Baptiſm with the Spirit and not to ſprinkling with water: When *Pag.* 87. he comes to reply againe, he offers not in the leaſt to prove that they are aplicable to Baptiſm with water, which is the thing in Queſtion; but tells me, *That thoſe Scriptures ſtrike againſt the Popiſh* opus operatum, quid inde? what then, doth it therefore follow that they are aplicable to ſprinkling with water, who is ſo blind as not to ſee through ſuch ſilly ſubterfugies? He addeth, *That I proceed upon a wrong ſuppoſition, as if they thought Baptiſm with water were of it ſelf effectual to cleanſe the Soul.*

Anſw. I never proceeded upon ſuch a ſuppoſition, that which I proceed upon is this, That they ſhould call or account ſprinkling with water, the Baptiſm of Chriſt, whereas the Scripture declares it not to be ſo, 2 *Pet.* 3. 21. Baptiſm is *not the putting away the filth of the fleſh*, &c. And alſo aſcribe ſuch Scriptures to ſprinkling with water, as are onely applicable to the Baptiſm of the Spirit, now this as is ſaid above, he hath left unanſwered.

Pag. 88. He ſaith, *That the one Baptiſm ſpoken of*, Eph. 4. 5. *cannot be called the ſubſtance, and Baptiſm with water the ſhadow, becauſe they are the ſame thing.* but this is pittifully to beg the thing in queſtion: And thus *W. Ms.* Arguments about Baptiſm runs round; Baptiſm with water is the one Baptiſm, becauſe the one Baptiſm is commanded by Chriſt, and the one Baptiſm is Baptiſm with water, becauſe Baptiſm with water is commanded by Chriſt; he wholly paſſes by that part of *Page* 52. of mine, where I ſhew

how abſurd and anteſcriptural their manner of baptizing is, and thereby he comes the more eaſily to his concluſion in this matter.

Head, 11. Concerning the Supper, *Pag.* 88. 89. He begin. confeſſing, *That Chriſts inſtituting of the Supper doth not prove its continuance*, and here he carps at my ſpeaking of it with this addition, (*The Lords Supper ſo called*) asking, *Why I give it not that name the Scripture gives it.*

Anſw. It is to be obſerved, that where I ſpeak of it thus, *Page* 52. of my laſt, that it is in my entry upon this matter, addreſſing my ſelf to him, my words are, Thou comeſt to prove that the Lords Supper, ſo called, *&c.* where I intended not that which was Inſtituted by Chriſt, and had its ſeaſon in the Church, but that which they call ſo, but really is not ſo, though they ſeek from this to draw a warrant for it; and whereas I ſhew him that by breaking of bread, *Act.* 2. 42. is meant their ordinary eating; His Anſwer is, *That their eating is not ordinary, but Scramental; and the Text ſpeaketh not of daily eating, but a continuing daily in the Temple, and that the* Syriack *expoſition expounds it of the* Euchariſt, but it is in vain, he thinks by his Imaginations to overturn the plain words of Scripture, *Act.* 2. 46 *And they continuing daily in the Temple with one accord, and breaking bread from houſe to houſe, did eat their meat with gladneſs and ſingleneſs of heart*; can there be any thing more plain, then that their breaking of bread here was their ordinary eating, and as for his talk of Sacramental eating, where doth he read of ſuch a phraſe in all the Bible? It is ill argued to ſay, I am ignorant of the way of ſome Proteſtant Churches, who uſes breaking of bread once a fortnight, or once a month, becauſe I ſay, their doing of it once or twice a year is not according to the example of ſuch as of old uſed it. *Pag.* 90. He adds, *That though this eating*, Act. 2. 46. *be conjoyned with this, that they ſould their poſſeſſions*, &c. *yet we are to follow them in the one and not in the other, becauſe the one was to continue and not the other*, but for this he bringeth no proof ſave his own bare aſſertion. After the like manner, *Pag.* 91. He ſayeth, *That though abſtaining from blood and things ſtrangled be commanded, yet the Apoſtle* Paul *repeats it extending Chriſtian Liberty, to whatſoever is ſould in the ſhambles*; but according to this he might argue, That though abſtaining from Circumciſſion be there commanded, yet *Pauls* Circumciſing of *Timothy* might now warrant it; And whereas he asketh, *If* Paul *Circumciſed*

cumciſed any other, what if he had not, Church hiſtory tells us that many yeares after ſeveral Biſhops of *Jeruſalem* were Circumciſed, it will not therefore follow that was a repealing of the Apoſtles determination by the holy Ghoſt, or that we ſhould continue in the uſe of Circumciſſion. He addeth, *That Waſhing of one anothers feet which was expreſly commanded, was not that we might practice it, but* only *to teach us humillity*; for this he adds no proof, it is onely his own conjecture; upon all which I deſire the Reader to obſerve, how *W. M.* can find ſhifts to evict thoſe above-ſaid which are expreſly commanded by Chriſt and his Apoſtles, and yet make ſuch a great noiſe of our forbearing water-Baptiſm and the external Supper, which are not more particularly preſſed; as alſo how we can ſay far more againſt the perpetuity of theſe laſt, then they againſt the former, and yet they clamor againſt us, as if ſo much as to call the conſtant uſe of them in queſtion, were to deſpiſe the Ordinances of Chriſt, *&c.* He asketh, *What clearer command there can be then theſe words, let a man examin himſelf and ſo let him eat*? But this queſtion does not at all prove theſe words to imply a command: His folly is obſerveable, *Pag.* 92. Where he deſires, *It may be obſerved, That the Corinthians were to be often in the uſe of it, becauſe it is ſaid*, As often as ye eat, *&c.* a rare argument indeed, by which he might conclude, that to ſay as often as a man ſins he offends God, did import we ſhould ſin often.

It is badly inferred, That this thing ought to continue by Divine Authority, becauſe the Apoſtle ſayes, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23. *That which I received of the Lord, have I delivered unto you*, ſeeing the very following words declare it, to have been the account of the matter of fact which he ſo received.

Sect. 1. *Pag.* 93. He ſlimly paſſes what is contained, *Pag.* 54. of mine, alledging, *I let off my great Guns, but make a noiſe without any ſpoyl.* The Reader by comparing theſe *Pages* together, will eaſily obſerve his lurking in this particular.

To my Queſtion, What the one bread is ſpoken of, 1 *Cor.* 10. 15,16. If it be the outward or the inward?

He *Anſwers*, *It is both the inward and the outward, and yet but one, in reſpect of the Sacramental Union, which is between the ſign and the thing ſignified*; Now to this I anſwered, in the end of *Pag.* 54. of my laſt, that it cannot be called one, becauſe of the agreement betwixt the ſigne and the thing ſignified, elſe by the ſame In-

ference one might plead for the continuance of all the Sacrifices and Offerings, and say they are all one with the one Offering mentioned, *Heb.* 10. 14. because they signified that one Offering; And whereas, *W. M.* reckons this a pittiful evasion, saying, *Any one may see a* Non sequitur *in it*, it would have become him better to have proved this by reason, then by his owne bare assertion, though any may observe this to be his constant course when other Arguments fail him. As he proceeds to prove the continuance of this practice, he sayes, *It cannot be denied there was once a command for it, and there is no repeal of it*, but the same recurs in washing one-anothers feet and anointing the sick with Oyl, *Jam.* 5. 14. which were as expressly commanded and never repealed, and yet *W. M.* can easily find a gloss to evict these, reckoning it a small matter to forbear them, he addeth, *That coming of Christ, till which, the Apostles were injoyned to be in the use of the outward Supper, must be meant of his outward comming so many years after, because such to whom Christ was come in the Spirit were found in the practice of it*; but this proves no more its continuance, *necessitate Precepti*, as he wordeth it, then the Circumcising and being Circumcised under the Gospel, will prove Circumcission to be binding upon us: He concludes saying, *That surely we are great enemies to our Souls that oppose this Ordinance*; But answereth not one word of *Page* 56. where I shew how great reason we have to forsake it, as also the many abuses where with they have corrupted it; it suffiseth him to say, *That it is meeter to pass it by then to reply unto it*, for part of it being about the quallifications of Persons, *W. M.* is loth to tell his Judgment, least he should harp upon the old *Independant* controversy; it is dangerous to touch this string, especially while he injoyes his hire under the shadow of *Episcopacy*.

Head, 12. Concerning the Ministry, *Pag.* 96. He hath nothing to say against my affirming, that the *Quakers* own the Ministry of the Word: *Pag.* 97. speaking of *Eph.* 4. 11. where *Paul* saith, *Christ gave some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers*; He saith, *The first three are Extraordinary and Tempory, the last two Ordinary and Perpetual*, for this he brings no Proof at all, but that frequent Argument, his own bare Assertion; And whereas I tould him, *Pag.* 58. of mine, That the former three were not ceased, citing for Proof *Calvin*, who, *Inst. lib.* 4. *cap* 3. avers, That in his day God raised up Apostels, and Evangelists; to this he answers

anſwers not one word: As he goes on he repeats my words, where I ſay, That though we own the Miniſtry not to be common, yet that doth not hinder but that any may ſpeak, as the Saints are met together, according to 1 *Cor.* 14. 31. asking, *How I can make out that? In that place is meant an ordinary Office*, though it might ſuffice for anſwer, to ask what reaſon *W. M.* hath to frame here his diſtinction of Ordinary and Extraordinary, yet it is obvious, that the Apoſtle is here preſenting the ordinary order of the Church, he needed not preſent an order to extraordinary Offices, for ſuch as are extraordinarily ſent, are alſo inſtructed how to go about their Office, and not limited to ſet Rules, elſe it were not extraordinary. *Pag.* 98. He goeth about to prove this diſtinction of Mediate and Immediate asking, *If the Prophets and Apoſtles, were not called imediatly? And if* Timothie *was not ſet apart to the work (imediatly) by the laying on of the hands of the* Preſbytery? What then? as the Apoſtles being called by the Lord did not hinder them from receiving the approbation and Teſtimony of the Brethren, yea laying on of hands, as did *Paul*, who without doubt was as imediatly ſent as any of the reſt, *Act.* 9. 17. So *Timothes* having the hands of the *Preſbytery* laid on him, doth not prove he wanted an inward imediate call in himſelf; it is without any proof at all what he ſubjoynes, That *Paul* ſaying he was an Apoſtle, not by man, doth oppoſe himſelf to Ordinary Miniſters; He adds, *That ſeeing I ſay, That thoſe who come* Preaching *the Goſpel, not in ſpeach onely, but alſo in* Power, *and in the holy Ghoſt, and in the evidence and demonſtration of the Spirit, give ſufficient proof that they are called of God*; he thinks I ſhould have favorable thoughts of Proteſtant Miniſters, who have given ſuch proofs of their Call.

Anſw. He ſhould have tould me what theſe Proteſtant Miniſters are, whom he ſayes we impiouſly cenſure, or by what Rule he or his Brethren, would be laying ſuch claim to be Proteſtant Miniſters, ſo as to exclude the *Quakers* from being ſuch.

Pag. 99. Though he quarrel me for ſaying, that with Papiſts he pleads for Miracles, he is ſo far from vindicating himſelf from this charge, that he giveth again new ground for it, ſaying, *That ſuch as aſſert an imediate call, ought to give tokens of it by Miracles*, &c. adding, *That though* John *did no Miracles, yet his call was attended with extraordinary things at his Conception and Birth*; Now this was the very objection, which the Papiſts made againſt the firſt Reformers

Reformers, to whom *Luther* and *Calvin* replyed, That though they had an imediate call, yet there was no need of Miracles, and this objection of *W. M.* is no other then that which almoſt *in totidem verbis*, in as many words was objected to *Beza*, at the conference of Poizy in *France*, by *Claudius Diſpenſus* Doctor of the Sarbone, who urged this very argument, of *John* the *Baptiſt*, confirming his call by the Teſtimony of *Malachy*, *&c.* Alledging, That they ought to confirm there call by Miracles; to whom theſe are *Beza*, his expreſs words, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* of *France*, *Pag.* 581. *And as to what diſpence, thou Alledge, that extraordinary Vocation is allways aproved by Miracles, or by the Teſtimony of the Prophets, I deny that it is allwayes ſo verified, but if we muſt come to Miracles, do you not think that the changing of the Life, the fruit which is ſeen to proceed from this Doctrine in our time by Perſons ſo contemptable, and ſo much perſecuted by the greateſt of the world, are not ſufficient Miracles, as ſaid the Apoſtle to the* Corinthians, *that they were the Seals of his Apoſtleſhip*: So the rational Reader may obſerve, that notwithſtanding of *W. Ms.* ſo often laying claim to the Proteſtant Churches, and Proteſtant Miniſtry, and crying out againſt us as oppoſers of them, he ſo directly makes uſe of Popiſh arguments againſt us and how we defend our ſelves, by no other but the very ſame anſwers the Proteſtants gave unto the Papiſts; yea of late, *W. Rett* preſent Preacher of *Dandy*, in his Book againſt Papiſts, printed but the laſt year at *Aberdeen*, doth plead, That Miracles are not needful, inſtancing, that *John* the Baptiſt did none; And ſo *W. M.* though he compare us to the *Jeſuites* in his Epiſtle, is ſo far one with them himſelf, that if his evaſion may be eſteemed of worth, whereby he ſeeks to overturn this example of *John* when brought by us, he will rather furniſh the *Jeſuites* with it to fight againſt his Brother *W. Rett*, or rather borrow it out of their atillery, whereby they fight againſt Proteſtants, then miſs to have a hit at the *Quakers*, may we not truely apply the inſtance in his Epiſtle to himſelf, that he is ſailing in one boat with Papiſts, though his face ſeems to look averſe from them.

Pag. 100 He ſaith, *Whatever inward call the Elders mentioned* Tit. 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. *had, yet they had not an imediate call, which is by the imediate command and voyce of God without the intervention of men*, but for this he adds no proof at all; nor is there any Inconſiſtancy betwixt being imediatly called by command from God, and afterwards

afterwards being aproved of men, or that being aproved and set apart by man excludes having an immediate call from God.

Sect. 1. *Pag.* 101. He sayes, *That* Eph. 4. 13. *is a pregnant and pertinent proof for the continuance of the Ministry*, which I never denied; But this doth not answer my saying, that it is impertinent as to them who deny perfection, seeing that place sayes, the Ministry is for the perfecting of the Saints; now to this he answers nothing, but that it cannot be gathered that this perfection is on Earth, which is but his own assertion, yea by himself there after overthrown, saying, *That the Ministry is given that we may press after an absolute full Perfection even of degrees*; for it is folly to press after this if there be no hopes of attaining it: He wholly passes by my objections against their Ministry, *Pag.* 59. especially, in that they make not the Grace of God, a necessary qualification to the *esse* or being of a Preacher, without so much as making any mention of it, where I also show, how contrary it is to the order delivered by the Apostles in Scripture; Therefore his conclusion is false, to say we cast off such a Ministry, seeing he was not able to prove theirs to be such, else he would not have wholy past in silence, my reasons shewing it not to be so.

His *Thirteenth Head*, *Pag.* 102. Is concerning the *Sabbath* or first day of the weeks being so, as to which I desire the Reader first to take notice, that as we believe the Apostles and primitive Christians did meet this day to worship God, so we as following their example do the like, and forbear working, or useing our lawful occasions upon that day as much as our Adversaries; so that the debate is onely, whether there be any inherent Holiness in this Day more then in another, or if there be any positive command for it from Scripture? Particularly, if the fourth command bind us to the observation of it? And here *W. M.* notwith-standing of his great pretences to the Protestant Churches, doth wholly disagree from them in this thing, who are of our mind as to it; the generality of all the Protestants both in *Germany*, *France*, and elsewhere out of this *Iland*, do look upon the supposed morrallity of the first day of the week as altogether ridiculous, which may be seen in *Calvin* upon the fourth command, *lib. inst.* 2. *cap.* 8. *Sect.* 34. where he explains the signification of it as we do, *Viz.* Typifing a Spiritual Rest, wherein leaving our own works the Spirit of God may work in us; he there refuts *W. Ms.* notion as a Jewish Opinion,

Opinion, saying, *Some false Doctors have abused ignorant People with it*, adding as we do, *That the Apostle* Paul *reproves such superstitions*, likewise he plainly asserts, *That the keeping of the first day is onely for conveniency, and to preserve order in the Church, that the Saints might have a fit time set apart to meet together to Worship*; which we also say, hence doth appear the folly of that impertinent story mentioned by him, *Pag.* 105. seeking to infer, *That we agree with Papist, in takeing away the fourth Command as they have done the second*, for by this he might conclude the first and chiefest Reformers guilty of Popery, whereas himself agrees with papists both against the Protestants abroad, & us, in pleading for this imaginary holiness of the first day of the week, which in his Dialogue he sought to prove because Christ did rise upon it; but to my answer showing he might from thence infer the rest of the Popish holydaies, of His Birth, Ascention, Conception, &c. he replies not one word, he summarly passes over what is said by me concerning this thing, *Page.* 59, 60, 61, and 62, which the Reader by looking unto may observe; He aledgeth, *The fourth command speaketh not precisly of the Seventh day, in order from the Creation, and that the beginning and ending of it, mentions the Sabbath day and not the Seventh*, quid inde? *&c.* What then? is not the middle of the command as observable? which saith expressly, *But the Seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord*, there God himself expounds the Sabbath to be the Seventh day, and *W. M.* must not think we will reject this exposition to accept of his proofless glosses: My argument drawn from *Coll.* 2. 16, 17. *Let no man judge you in respect of a holy day or Sabbath dayes*, and *Rom.* 14. 6. which sheweth all dayes to be alike and *Gal.* 4 10, 11. *Ye observe dayes, and months, times, and years*; He answereth, aledging, *These reprove not morral dayes, but ceremonial*, adding, *That the fourth command binds to this, and therefore it cannot be more abrogate then any of the rest of the ten commands* but this is no proof at all, onely a meer begging the question, he should have more convincingly proved that the fourth command binds to the observation of this day; Now the Apostle in these places sayeth not, I am afraid of you because ye observe ceremonial dayes: *W. M.* hath no bottom for this distinction, he confesseth that Christ, *Mat.* 24. 20. speaketh nothing of the first day of the week, and therefore overthrowes the inference he makes in his Dialogue from it, and what I further add to show the folly of this inference

from

from the Scripture; He hath wholly omited which the Reader may ſee, *Pag.* 59, 60. of my laſt.

Pag. 106. He ſayes, *Oh! the conſcientious keeping of the Sabbath is a comfortable evidence of thoſe that ſhall be admitted to this Reſt*, viz. *the reſt of the Lamb.* But ſeeing theſe words are without any proof, they are only like to have credit with ſuch ſilly ſuperſtitious Bigots, as *Calvin* in the place above mentioned reproves, and not with any ſolid ſerious Chriſtians.

Sect. 2. *Pag.* 107. To prove, that the firſt day of the week is ſet apart for the ſervice of God, by Divine Authority, he citeth, *Rev.* 1. 10. *I was in the Spirit on the Lords day*; but whereas I told him this did no way prove that day to be the firſt day of the week, becauſe the day of the Lord, or the Lords day in Scripture, is not limited to any particular day.

He anſwers, *That theſe two ought not to be confounded, for all dayes wherein the Lord executeth judgement, are dayes of the Lord; but the Lords day, mentioned, Rev.* 1. *is but one.* For this he bringeth no proof but his own meer aſſertion: As *Ignatius* calling the firſt day of the week, *The Queen of dayes*, doth not prove that Lords day, ſpoken of by *John*, to be the firſt day, ſo if *Ignatius* had been of this mind, and had eſteemed of it above other dayes, that makes nothing againſt us; we know this Superſtition was creeping into the Church before *Ignatius*'s time, therefore the Apoſtle *Paul* warned the *Galatians*, Gal. 4. 10, 11.

To prove this day ſpoken of by *John* to be the firſt day of the week, he ſaith, *Chriſt appeared to his Diſciples, declared himſelf to be the Son of God, upon the firſt day of the week*; *That it is ſuppoſed that was the day the Spirit was poured forth*: And that *Beza, in an ancient Greek Manuſcript, did find the firſt day of the week called the Lords day.* But all this doth not in the leaſt prove the matter in queſtion, except this may ſuffice for proof, *W. M.* thinks this will infer the day of the Lord, ſpoken of by *John*, to be the firſt day of the week, therefore it is ſo. There may be Superſtition enough found in old *Greek* Manuſcripts; It is near fourteen hundred years ſince the *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern* Churches were like to ſplit about the obſervation of *Eaſter*, and yet Proteſtants with good reaſon look upon that Controverſie as both Superſtitious and frivolous.

Now giving, but not granting this day ſpoken of by *John*, were the firſt day of the week, How doth he prove from this, that the

firſt

firſt day of the week is come to Chriſtians in place of the *Jewiſh* Sabbath, or that it ſtands as an obligation upon them, as a part of the moral Law whereunto we are bound by the forth Command, which though it be the cheif thing in debate remaines yet unproved; ſeeing then he has had very few proofs for theſe his ſuppoſed Ordinances but ſuch as are onely bottomed upon his own affirmations, the Juditious Reader may judge it is without ground he concludes here, that we deny the Ordinances of Chriſt and not the inventions of men.

His *fourteenth Head, Pag.* 109 Is concerning Original ſin ſo called, which the Reader by comparing with *Pag.* 62, 63, 64. and 65. of mine, will ſee that he makes no reall, but a meer counterfeit ſhew of anſwer; and I deſire the Reader firſt to obſerve, That neither here nor in his Dialogue, he doth not ſo much as offer to prove that this phraſe *Original ſin*, is to be found in Scripture; and for all his pretences to make the Scripture his rule, he hath no ground from this, but from Popiſh Tradition.

Secondly, That we grant a reall Seed of ſin, derived from Sathan which *Adams* Poſterity is liable to; But we ſay, none become guilty of this before God nutill they cloſe with this evill Seed, and in them who cloſe with it, it becomes an Origine or Fountain of evill thoughts, deſires, words and actions:

And as by granting all capeable of receiving this real Seed of ſin we differ from the *Socinians*, and *Pelagians*; So by ſaying it is not the Childrens ſin until they do cloſe with it: We agree with *Zuinglius* a famous Proteſtant, who for this very Doctrine was condemned by the Council of *Trent*, in the *Art.* of the *Fifth Seſ. Conſ. Trent, lib.* 2. *Pag.* 208. The acts of which Council, not onely againſt us, but againſt this famous founder of the Proteſtant Churches in *Zuitſerland*, is that which *W. M.* is here vindicating.

Thirdly, I deſire the Reader may obſerve, That the thing he pleads for is, that Infants are really guilty before God, that Infants are guilty before God ſimply for *Adams* ſin; And that ſome of them who die in their Infancy, and never actually ſin in their own Perſons, do for this ſin of *Adam* Eternally periſh: Now whither this Doctrine be ſutable either to the Juſtice or Mercy of God, I leave the Chriſtian Reader to judge. I ſhall examine the reaſons he brings for it, his cheif argument for this in his Dialogue *Pag.* 47. was, That becauſe Children die, citing *Rom.* 23. *The wages of ſin is death*, now I ſhew him, *Pag.* 64. of mine, how that made nothing,

because natural Death of the Saints is not the wages of sin; for their sins are forgiven them, &c. this he hath not so much as mentioned, far less answered; And whereas he might as well argue that the Earth, Trees and Herbs were sinners, because they received great decay by *Adams* sin; He slightly passes it over, aledging, *It will not therefore follow, that all mankind who suffer Death are not Sinners*; Now this is no answer but a meer shift, and the thing I intended against his assertion, doth very naturally follow from my argument; thus, If as *W. M.* sayes, Infants be guilty of *Adams* Sin, because they are subject to diseases and Death, then the Beasts who are subject to the like, and the Earth, Herbs and Trees, who have received their decay are sinners before God; but this is absurd, therefore the other, let him answer this the next time more effectually.

The first proof he brings here is, 1 *Joh.* 3. 6. *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, adding, *This intimates man by his natural Birth to be Corrupt and Fleshly*; But for this his gloss he bringeth no proof; though, *That which is born of the flesh* be *flesh*, he showeth us not how it followeth thence, that Infants are guilty of *Adams* Sin; after the like manner he concludes this his doctrine from, *Job.* 14. 4. *Psal.* 5. 5. But as the words in these places do not plainly express any such thing, so he brings no reason to make his consequences deduceable from them; after the like proof-less manner he aledgeth, *Rom.* 5. 14. *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners*; Now, though the matter in question be, Whether these many were made sinners before they actually sinned in their own Persons? He doth not so much as offer to prove it; in the like manner, though *David* said his Mother conceived him in sin, he sheweth us not how it followeth from thence, that *David* was guilty of sin before he actually sinned; and here I observe how he asserts, That men are guilty of the sin of their immoderate Parents, contrary to the plain Testimony of the Scripture *Ezek.* 18. 20. *The Son shall not bare the iniquity of the Father*: To prove Infants thus guilty he further addeth, *Rom.* 5. 12. aledging these words; *For that all have sinned*, includes Infants, but I shew him this includes not Infants, because the Apostle clears it in the next verse, saying, *Sin is not imputed where there is no law*, and that there being no Law to Infants, they cannot be guilty of sin; To this he replies, *There was a Law to* Adam *and that he represented mankind, and stood as a publik Person, Therefore Children had a Law in him*; But for this signification of his own he produceth no proof, and it cannot be received, as being direct

firſt day of the week is come to Chriſtians in place of the *Jewiſh* Sabbath, or that it ſtands as an obligation upon them, as a part of the moral Law whereunto we are bound by the forth Command, which though it be the cheif thing in debate remaines yet unproved; ſeeing then he has had very few proofs for theſe his ſuppoſed Ordinances but ſuch as are onely bottomed upon his own affirmations, the Juditious Reader may judge it is without ground he concludes here, that we deny the Ordinances of Chriſt and not the inventions of men.

His *fourteenth Head, Pag.* 109 Is concerning Original ſin ſo called, which the Reader by comparing with *Pag.* 62, 63, 64. and 65. of mine, will ſee that he makes no reall, but a meer counterfeit ſhew of anſwer; and I deſire the Reader firſt to obſerve, That neither here nor in his Dialogue, he doth not ſo much as offer to prove that this phraſe *Original ſin*, is to be found in Scripture; and for all his pretences to make the Scripture his rule, he hath no ground from this, but from Popiſh Tradition:

Secondly, That we grant a reall Seed of ſin, derived from Sathan which *Adams* Poſterity is liable to; But we ſay, none become guilty of this before God nutill they cloſe with this evill Seed, and in them who cloſe with it, it becomes an Origine or Fountain of evill thoughts, deſires, words and actions:

And as by granting all capeable of receiving this real Seed of ſin we differ from the *Socinians*, and *Pelagians*; So by ſaying it is not the Childrens ſin until they do cloſe with it: We agree with *Zuinglius* a famous Proteſtant, who for this very Doctrine was condemned by the Council of *Trent*, in the *Art.* of the *Fifth Seſ. Conſ. Trent, lib.* 2. *Pag.* 208. The acts of which Council, not onely againſt us, but againſt this famous founder of the Proteſtant Churches in *Zuitſerland*, is that which *W.* M. is here vindicating.

Thirdly, I deſire the Reader may obſerve, That the thing he pleads for is, that Infants are really guilty before God, that Infants are guilty before God ſimply for *Adams* ſin; And that ſome of them who die in their Infancy, and never actually ſin in their own Perſons, do for this ſin of *Adam* Eternally periſh: Now whither this Doctrine be ſutable either to the Juſtice or Mercy of God, I leave the Chriſtian Reader to judge. I ſhall examine the reaſons he brings for it, his cheif argument for this in his Dialogue, *Pag.* 47. was, That becauſe Children die, citing *Rom.* 23. *The wages of ſin is death*, now I ſhew him, *Pag*, 64. of mine, how that made nothing,

 becauſe

because natural Death of the Saints is not the wages of sin; for their sins are forgiven them, &c. this he hath not so much as mentioned, far less answered; And whereas he might as well argue that the Earth, Trees and Herbs were sinners, because they received great decay by *Adams* sin; He slightly passes it over, aledging, *It will not therefore follow, that all mankind who suffer Death are not Sinners*; Now this is no answer but a meer shift, and the thing I intended against his assertion, doth very naturally follow from my argument; thus, If as *W. M.* sayes, Infants be guilty of *Adams* Sin, because they are subject to diseases and Death, then the Beasts who are subject to the like, and the Earth, Herbs and Trees, who have received their decay are sinners before God; but this is absurd, therefore the other, let him answer this the next time more effectually.

The first proof he brings here is, 1 *Joh.* 3. 6. *That which is born of the flesh is flesh*, adding, *This intimates man by his natural Birth to be Corrupt and Fleshly*; But for this his gloss he bringeth no proof; though, *That which is born of the flesh* be *flesh*, he showeth us not how it followeth thence, that Infants are guilty of *Adams* Sin; after the like manner he concludes this his doctrine from, *Job.* 14. 4. *Psal.* 5. 5. But as the words in these places do not plainly express any such thing, so he brings no reason to make his consequences deduceable from them; after the like proof-less manner he aledgeth, *Rom.* 5. 14. *By one mans disobedience many were made sinners*; Now, though the matter in question be, Whether these many were made sinners before they actually sinned in their own Persons? He doth not so much as offer to prove it; in the like manner, though *David* said his Mother conceived him in sin, he sheweth us not how it followeth from thence, that *David* was guilty of sin before he actually sinned; and here I observe how he asserts, That men are guilty of the sin of their immoderate Parents, contrary to the plain Testimony of the Scripture *Ezek.* 18. 20. *The Son shall not bare the iniquity of the Father*: To prove Infants thus guilty he further addeth, *Rom.* 5. 12. aledging these words; *For that all have sinned*, includes Infants, but I shew him this includes not Infants, because the Apostle clears it in the next verse, saying, *Sin is not imputed where there is no law*, and that there being no Law to Infants, they cannot be guilty of sin; To this he replies, *There was a Law to* Adam *and that he represented mankind, and stood as a publik Person, Therefore Children had a Law in him*; But for this signification of his own he produceth no proof, and it cannot be received, as being direct

contrary to the Scripture above mentioned, *The Son ſhall not bare the Fathers iniquity*; He aledgeth, *That thoſe the Apoſtle ſpeaks of who ſinned not after the ſimilitude of* Adams *Tranſgreſſion are Infants*, but after his uſual manner bringeth not the leaſt proof for it; the, 1 *Cor.* 15. 22. cited by him, is ſo far from makeing any thing for his purpoſe, that it maketh directly againſt him, which any that have the leaſt grain of true underſtanding may perceive; the words are, *As in Adam all died, even ſo in Chriſt, all are made alive*; for here all are ſaid to die in *Adam*, even as all are ſaid to be made alive in Chriſt; now as none are made alive in Chriſt until they actually receive, and joyne with his Righteouſneſs, ſo none die in *Adam* until they actually receive, and joyn with his unrighteouſneſs, &c. He maketh a deal a do *Pag.* 110, 111. about the *Greek* αφῶ, wherein though it were eaſie to refute him, were it not needleſs to fill up paper with Gramatical Criticiſmes; for giving, but not granting the words might be Tranſlated, in *Adam all have ſinned*, it will not from thence follow that Infants are guilty before they actually ſin, ſeeing all are ſaid to die, or have ſinned in *Adam*, even as all are ſaid to be made alive in Chriſt; and yet none are ſaid to be ſo, until they actually receive his Righteouſneſs as is above demonſtrated.

Pag. 113. He aledgeth, *Though it be ſaid that the Kingdom of God is of little Children, yet ſome Infants are not ſaved, becauſe they are not of the Kingdome of Grace*; But for this he bringeth no proof at all: And I here take notice, That he acknowledges, that God Sanctifies and Regenerats ſome Infants, and thereby he notably contradicts his *ſecond Sect.* concerning the Light. And *Pag.* 29. of his Dialogue, where he condems it, as a dangerous errour in us, to ſay any can be ſaved without the outward knowledg of Chriſt, of which Infants are not capable to prove, That ſome Infants periſh, even eternally, He aledgeth, *The burning of Sodom and Gomorrah*, citing *Jude.* 7. But his wreſting this Scripture is very manifeſt, for the reaſon *Jude* gives of their *ſuffering vengance*, was, becauſe they gave themſelves up to Fornication, and went after ſtrange fleſh; Now of this Infants were not capable, of whom therefore *Jude* ſpeaks not one word. He terms *Impudent* or elſe *Ignorant*, for bringing, *Mat.* 1. 22. againſt them, aledging, *It is an unjuſt charge, to ſay they plead for a Salvation in their ſins*; and yet he has the Impudence immediatly to aver it himſelf, ſaying, *They are but in part*

delivered

becau-

delivered or ſaved in this Life; do they not then dream of Salvation while in part they remain in their ſins? Compare, *Math.* 1. 21. with 1 *Joh.* 1. 7. Chriſt is ſaid to cleanſe us from all iniquity, not a part of it: It is a bad inference drawn from my aſſertion, that Children are not guilty of ſin, to ſay that therefore they need not a Saviour; I told him in my laſt, Chriſt was truely a Saviour unto them in that he kept them from ſinning, as one that's kept from faling in a ditch is as truely ſaved as he that's taken out of one: It is altogether Inconſequential to infer from this, That Chriſt died to ſave the holy Angels from ſin, becauſe they are not ſuffered to fall into it, for Chriſt is ſaid onely to have died for *Adams* Poſterity, of which number Infants are, but not Angels. It is likewiſe without reaſon, that he compares us to *Pelagians*, as if we took from Chriſt the name Jeſus, ſeeing it has been ſhown we own him to be Jeſus, or Saviour to all, even to Infants.

He beginneth his *fifteenth Head*, Concerning the perſeverance of the Saints, *Pag.* 115. Aledging, *That in ſaying the Quakers hold not a falling away from Regeneration, I ſeek to hide my ſelf; Becauſe* G. Keith *ſayes, That Saints may fall away from ſaving Grace; asking, if Saints be Regenerate.*

Anſw. Though all that be fully Regenerate are Saints, yet ſome may be called Saints who are not fully Regenerate.

Pag. 116. He aledgeth, *It is in vain to aſſert this falling away; becauſe it is ſaid, Some who believed afterwards fell away, and ſome mak ſhipwrack of the Faith; and ſome who taſted of the good word of God, and the powers of the life to come, &c.* Becauſe they uſe to diſtingiſh betwixt ſeeming counterfeit Grace, and ſound ſaving Grace.

Anſw. Can there be any more palpable wreſting of Scripture? For if ſo be, that Faith which they had were not real, they were not to be blamed for falling away from it, it were their mercy to make ſhipwrack of that which was counterfeit: The Apoſtle ſpeaks poſitively, *Heb.* 6. 4. of the capacity of ſuch to fall away, *who were once enlightned, who have taſted of the heavenly gift*, yea, *who were partakers of the holy ghoſt, and have taſted of the good word of God; and the powers of the world to come*; he ſayeth not they ſeemed to be ſo: Nay the very context ſheweth the contrary, ſaying, *It is impoſible to renew ſuch again to repentance*; Now had this been all in appearance, the Apoſtle needed not to ſpeak of *renewing them again*

again to repentance, or ſay, *they crucifie the Son of God afreſh*, ſeeing if ſo, they had never been penitent and been allways Crucifiers of Chriſt; whereas in anſwer to *Phil.* 1. 6. I tould him it might be ſuppoſed that *Paul* was as confident that God would perfect the work in himſelf as in any other, and yet he ſuppoſes the contrary where he ſayes, *Leaſt preaching the goſpel to others, I my ſelf become a caſtaway*; to this he replieth nothing, but citeth another Scripture, *Jer.* 32. 29. *I will give them one heart that they may fear me for ever*; though God give them this, that they may fear him yet ſuch may abuſe the gift of God, and ſo run out of his fear, he gives to all his Grace, and yet it is ſaid, that ſome turn it unto wantonneſs, *Jud.* 4. He jeereth at my anſwer to *Peter*, ſaying, *A goodly reply forſooth*, as if he had ſaid, if the Saints fall from Faith they muſt fall, but he might ſpare his inſulting, until he had found ſome way to anſwer my words, which are, That thoſe that abide not in the Power of God through Faith, muſt fall away; for he might as well Scoff at all the conditional Promiſes of the Goſpel, ſuch as, *He that continueth ſtedfaſt to the end ſhall obtain the crown*: To ſay that Faith and the Power of God concurs to prevent the Saints faling away, anſwers nothing, for ſo long as theſe concur, we do not deny it, and though they be allways willing to concur, yet it is clear that ſome who have believed, not counterfetily but really have departed from the power and ſo fallen away as is above ſhown.

Pag. 117. Upon the words of, *Jer.* 32. 40. He ſayes, *It proves the perſeverance or impoſſibillity of faling away, becauſe it is ſaid, God put his fear in their hearts for this end, That they might not depart from him*, what then, that doth not prove that they cannot depart from him, Chriſt came to his own for this end, that he might ſave them; and yet it is ſaid they received him not, *Joh.* 1. 11. He ſayes, *I make ſhort work of theſe Scriptures*, Joh. 10. 27, 28. Joh. 13. 1. 1 Joh. 2. 19. becauſe I ſay, they ſpeak of thoſe who were come to a through Regeneration, which he ſayes is without proof; But the Reader by looking unto them will find they cannot be underſtood otherways, then of ſuch as are throughly Regenerate, and it appears he was ſenſible of this, having produced nothing to the contrary, and whereas he adds, *That if thoſe who are throughly Regenerate were onely to perſevere, then this were the priviledge of Saints in heaven, and not in earth, who never come to be ſo*; there can be nothing more rediculus, then this manner of arguing, ſeeing that queſtion

queſtion whether the Saints can be perfectly Regenerate on Earth is as much in debate as the other? That objection of his, as if from this Doctrine it might follow one were a Child of God to day, and a Child of the Devil to morrow, I anſwered in my laſt. *Pag.* 66. to which he returneth no anſwer, and therefore it is diſingenuity in him to bring it forth here again; and whereas in *Pag.* 66, 67. of my laſt I ſhew him how he contradicted himſelf in this matter, by granting ſome of the *Quakers* to have been truly converted, and yet now to condemn them as Apoſtates; he is ſo far from reconciling it, that he avers it anew in plain terms ſaying, *Pag.* 118. *That ſome of them have felt a gratious opperation on their hearts*; and *Pag.* 9. *He cannot but think, That ſome of them were ſavingly wrought upon*, and yet adds, *That it is clear that they have Apoſtatiſed from the Truth*; Now to reconcile this he hath nothing to ſay, *But he truſts the Lord will convince them.*

Anſw. As ſome of them, to whom he and his Brethren were forced to give the Teſtimony of gratious Perſons, have already departed this Life not onely not ſhrinking from, but even Teſtifying to theſe Truths he calls error, ſo others whom they have alſo accounted gratious, having been at deaths door have aſſerted the ſame Truth and rejoyced in it, which ſuffiſeth to overturn his vain confidence, and truly ſuch a groundleſs hope is but a poor ſhift to reconcile ſo palpable a contradiction; whereby while in words they condem this Doctrine of the capacity of mans falling away from Grace, yet as to the experience of ſome particulars they are forced to acknowledg it, for fear they ſhould fall in greater Inconveniences of granting ſome among the *Quakers* to be choice Saints.

His *Sixteenth Head*, *Pag.* 119. Is to prove the danger of *Quakeriſme*, as he terms it, but that his folly may appeare in this particular, I deſire the Reader firſt to obſerve our Principle which he concludes ſo hazardous, even as repeated by himſelf *Pag.* 121. *Viz. That a man cannot, nor ought not to Pray without the Spirits motion*; *and to ſay none can Pray without it, hath no bad tendency, becauſe all ſuch Prayers as are performed without the help of the Spirit, are Abomination, not true Prayers, but hypocritical and deceitful*; Now he cannot deny this, and therefore grants it to be true, yea ſaith plainly in the next *Page*, *That Prayer without the Spirit is Abomination*, And whereas he adds, *That forbearing of Prayer is alſo Abomination*, we do not deny it, but freely confeſs, that forbearing

forbearing of Prayer in the wicked is ſinful, but the way to prevent this, is not to commit a ſecond evill, *Viz.* to Pray without the Spirit, they ought firſt to come to the Spirit, that thereby they may Pray acceptably, according to that of *Paul*, Rom. 8. 26. *Likewiſe the Spirit alſo helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we ſhould Pray for as we ought: but the Spirit it ſelf maketh interceſſion for us with groans that cannot be uttered*, 1 Cor. 14. 15. *I will pray with the Spirit*; which being brought by me in my laſt, he hath wholly omitted ſo much as to mention, far leſs to anſwer: And though omiting of Prayer be ſinful, yet to bid a man Pray without the Spirit, is as much as to deſire a man to ſee without opening his eyes: This thing may appeare by a familar example, thus, ſuppoſe a ſervant turn ſlugard, and ſleep while he ſhould be about his Maſters work, if when he is raiſed out of his bed he ſhould run naked to it, without taking along thoſe Tools or Inſtruments which are abſolutly needful for the doing of it, what will he profit either himſelf or his Maſter? Yea he will but hinder the work more: Even ſo the wicked, as they ought to Pray, ſo they ought firſt to come to the Spirit, whereby they may do it to the glory of God, and their own Souls good. Now though this be ſo undeniable that he cannot gainſay it, yet in contradiction to the Truth and his own Conceſſions, he goes about to cavil againſt it, aledging, *It might take off men as well from their neceſſary works, becauſe the ploughing of the wicked is ſin; and that alſo it might follow from this, That Children ſhould not honour their Parents, and Huſbands love their Wives, but when they have a motion of the Spirit for it.*

Anſw. This objection hath no weight to overturn the Truth, for there is a great difference betwixt theſe things that relate to the worſhip of God, and what relates to outward things, either concerning our ſelves or our neighbours; The worſhip of God is a Spiritual thing relating to himſelf, which we are commanded to perform in the Spirit, and God doth offer us his Spirit for the performance of it; And becauſe it is that which is meerly relative betwixt God and the Soul, he doth not accept of it but as ſo offered, we cannot Pray as we ought ſaith the Apoſtle, *But the Spirit helpeth*, &c. Now though theſe other things would no doubt be the more acceptable to God, and more frequently accompanied with his bleſſing, that they were done in the ſence of his fear, and in the drawings of his Spirit, yet they are materially good in themſelves, anſwering

anſwering really their end to them unto whom they immediatly relate without it, but it is not ſo of Prayer, which as it immediately relates to God, ſo *W. M.* himſelf confeſſeth without the Spirit to be Abomination: Thus is alſo ſolved his ſuppoſition, *Pag.* 124. *That if a wicked man contract guilt he may provoke the Lord to withdraw the motions of the Spirit, and then his not Praying is not ſin*, for I have aſſerted, that the not Praying of the wicked is ſinful, and this doth not lull People in a ſinful ſecurity; on the contrary they are like rather to be lulled in ſuch a ſecurity by being told they may be ſet about Prayer when they pleaſe, whereby they foſter themſelves in a groundleſs hope, becauſe of their now and then repeating their words of Prayer, neither expecting nor looking for the Spirits aſſiſtance, whereby inſtead of advancing in Grace and Righteouſneſs, they do but reiterate Abominations, and ſo aggrevate their own guilt: And whereas here he is forced to acknowledg that motives of the Spirit will not be wanting to the Saints to Pray when they are at the gates of Death, or in danger of preſent Drowning; He asks me, *What ſhall the wicked do in this caſe? Shall they not follow the advice which* Peter *gave to* Simon Magus, *Act.* 8. 22. *pray God, if perhaps the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee*, but here he minceth the Apoſtles words which are, *Repent therefore of thy wickedneſs, and pray, &c.* here the Apoſtle puts repentance before Prayer, it ſhall not be denied, but when the wicked have repented of their wickedneſs, the Spirit will not be wanting to aſſiſt them to Pray. It is therefore to little purpoſe, That *Pag.* 120. and 121. He pleads, *For craving a Bleſſing when we uſe the creatures of God, calling the neglect of it a phrophane cuſtome*; for we do not deny it, and condemn a prophane neglect of it as much as themſelves; And as Chriſt had the Spirit without and above meaſure, having all wayes a ready acceſs to the Father, ſo we are glad and willing at ſuch occaſions to expreſs words, if we find the Spirit aſſiſting us ſo to do, yea we reckon that we ought not to uſe the creatures, without our hearts be in ſome meaſure retired to the fence of Gods preſence, and ſtayed in his fear, whereby we may ſecretly breath for a Bleſſing, for to ſpeak audible words is not eſſential, and therefore it is apparently malitious for him to ſay, *That when we are not ſtayed in Gods fear, we have liberty and freedom to fall to mine*: my words had no ſuch importance, though he ſeeks to turn them, and yet can wholly omit much of *Pag.* 67. of mine, where I

forbearing of Prayer in the wicked is ſinful, but the way to prevent this, is not to commit a ſecond evill, *Viz.* to Pray without the Spirit, they ought firſt to come to the Spirit, that thereby they may Pray acceptably, according to that of *Paul*, Rom. 8. 26. *Likewiſe the Spirit alſo helpeth our infirmities: for we know not what we ſhould Pray for as we ought: but the Spirit it ſelf maketh interceſſion for us with groans that cannot be uttered*, 1 Cor. 14. 15. *I will pray with the Spirit*; which being brought by me in my laſt, he hath wholly omitted ſo much as to mention, far leſs to anſwer: And though omiting of Prayer be ſinful, yet to bid a man Pray without the Spirit, is as much as to deſire a man to ſee without opening his eyes: This thing may appeare by a familar example, thus, ſuppoſe a ſervant turn ſlugard, and ſleep while he ſhould be about his Maſters work, if when he is raiſed out of his bed he ſhould run naked to it, without taking along thoſe Tools or Inſtruments which are abſolutly needful for the doing of it, what will he profit either himſelf or his Maſter? Yea he will but hinder the work more: Even ſo the wicked, as they ought to Pray, ſo they ought firſt to come to the Spirit, whereby they may do it to the glory of God, and their own Souls good. Now though this be ſo undeniable that he cannot gainſay it, yet in contradiction to the Truth and his own Conceſſions, he goes about to cavil againſt it, aledging, *It might take off men as well from their neceſſary works, becauſe the ploughing of the wicked is ſin*; *and that alſo it might follow from this, That Children ſhould not honour their Parents, and Huſbands love their Wives, but when they have a motion of the Spirit for it.*

Anſw. This objection hath no weight to overturn the Truth, for there is a great difference betwixt theſe things that relate to the worſhip of God, and what relates to outward things, either concerning our ſelves or our neighbours; The worſhip of God is a Spiritual thing relating to himſelf, which we are commanded to perform in the Spirit, and God doth offer us his Spirit for the performance of it; And becauſe it is that which is meerly relative betwixt God and the Soul, he doth not accept of it but as ſo offered, we cannot Pray as we ought ſaith the Apoſtle, *But the Spirit helpeth*, &c. Now though theſe other things would no doubt be the more acceptable to God, and more frequently accompanied with his bleſſing, that they were done in the fence of his fear, and in the drawings of his Spirit, yet they are materially good in themſelves, anſwering

anſwering really their end to them unto whom they immediatly relate without it, but it is not ſo of Prayer, which as it immediately relates to God, ſo *W. M.* himſelf confeſſeth without the Spirit to be Abomination: Thus is alſo ſolved his ſuppoſition, *Pag.* 124. *That if a wicked man contract guilt he may provoke the Lord to withdraw the motions of the Spirit, and then his not Praying is not ſin*, for I have aſſerted, that the not Praying of the wicked is ſinful, and this doth not lull People in a ſinful ſecurity; on the contrary they are like rather to be lulled in ſuch a ſecurity by being told they may be ſet about Prayer when they pleaſe, whereby they foſter themſelves in a groundleſs hope, becauſe of their now and then repeating their words of Prayer, neither expecting nor looking for the Spirits aſſiſtance, whereby inſtead of advancing in Grace and Righteouſneſs, they do but reiterate Abominations, and ſo aggrevate their own guilt: And whereas here he is forced to acknowledg, that motives of the Spirit will not be wanting to the Saints to Pray when they are at the gates of Death, or in danger of preſent Drowning; He asks me, *What ſhall the wicked do in this caſe? Shall they not follow the advice which* Peter *gave to* Simon Magus, Act. 8. 22. *pray God, if perhaps the thoughts of thy heart may be forgiven thee*, but here he minceth the Apoſtles words which are, *Repent therefore of thy wickedneſs, and pray, &c.* here the Apoſtle puts repentance before Prayer, it ſhall not be denied, but when the wicked have repented of their wickedneſs, the Spirit will not be wanting to aſſiſt them to Pray. It is therefore to little purpoſe, That *Pag.* 120. and 121. He pleads, *For craving a Bleſſing when we uſe the creatures of God, calling the neglect of it a phrophane cuſtome*; for we do not deny it, and condemn a prophane neglect of it as much as themſelves; And as Chriſt had the Spirit without and above meaſure, having all wayes a ready acceſs to the Father, ſo we are glad and willing at ſuch occaſions to expreſs words, if we find the Spirit aſſiſting us ſo to do, yea we reckon that we ought not to uſe the creatures, without our hearts be in ſome meaſure retired to the fence of Gods preſence, and ſtayed in his fear, whereby we may ſecretly breath for a Bleſſing, for to ſpeak audible words is not eſſential, and therefore it is apparently malitious for him to ſay, *That when we are not ſtayed in Gods fear, we have liberty and freedom to fall to meat*; my words had no ſuch Importance, though he ſeeks to turn them, and yet can wholly omit much of *Pag.* 67. of mine, where I

ſhew their abuſes in this matter, how they mock God in it and provoke him to withdraw his Bleſſing; And whereas he ſayes, *One of us confeſſed, That he had not called together nor Prayed in his family for a twelve-month paſt*; He ſhould have produced the perſons name, that we might have inquired concerning it, and therefore until he ſo do, we can lay no ſtreſs upon it but reject it as falſe, eſpecially conſidering, that *W. M.* being particularly challenged upon this refuſeth abſolutly to do it, nor durſt he aver he had any better ground for it then hear-ſay: Upon this occaſion he asks, *If* Abraham *muſt not keep up Religion in his family becauſe an* Iſhmael *is in it*, but this maketh nothing againſt us, for none of us that are Maſters of Families, have forborn to keep up the worſhip of God, though enemies of Truth have been in it, whom we have not barred from being preſent; And for whom we have not been wanting to Pray, though we cannot joyn with them in their Prayers, as *W. M.* adviſeth us, until firſt they repent of their wickedneſs: This was the method of *Peters* advice to *Simon Magus*, firſt to repent and then to Pray, as is above ſhewed.

Sect. *Pag.* 125. He ſayes, *Quakeriſme tends to make Mortification of ſin uſeleſs*, and to me, asking, *Whether Mortification be uſeleſs where the end of it* (*which is Perfection*) *is atained*? He anſwereth, *That Perfection is toofold, comparative and abſolute, and ſeeing we are for an abſolute Perfection, there is no uſe for Mortification.*

Anſw. There can none come to this abſolute Perfection, (as he terms it) but by Mortification of ſin, and even ſuch as are ſo Perfect while on earth, do conſtantly uſe Mortification to keep down ſin, leaſt it riſe again, and to reſiſt the Temptations of the enemy, wherewith even ſuch as be Perfect are daily aſſaulted. He aledgeth, *I Triumph before the Victory, in quarreling him for ſaying, That a ſinleſs Perfection wounds the very vitals of Religion*; But his ſilly ſubterfuge in this place may eaſily be diſcovered: I asked him in my laſt, that ſeeing he ſayes ſo, Whether the vitals of Religion conſiſted in ſinning or not ſinning? Adding, That if it conſiſt in ſinningthey that ſin moſt are moſt Religious, but if it conſiſt in not ſinning, then to plead for ſuch a thing as attainable, hurts not the vitals of Religion; to this he anſwereth, *That the vitals of Religion conſiſt in the means appointed of God*: Who ſeeth not this to be a meer evaſion; Why did he not give a direct anſwer? But that he could not, without either denying his former Antichriſtian expreſſion, or

elſe

elſe faling into palpable groſeneſs; And whereas he adds, *That theſe means are Repentance, Mortification, Believing, application of the Blood of Chriſt*; though it be no anſwer to my queſtion, I deny not, but that Religion conſiſts in theſe things; but I ſuppoſe he will not ſay that they are ſinning: It is not in the leaſt abſurd, that one who hath attained to Perfection may practice theſe duties; Man though he have attained to Perfection cannot too much repent of his former wickedneſs, and therefore it is without ground that he aledgeth, *That I ſhift, and cannot deny but the forbearance of theſe duties flow as a conſequence from our Principle*, nor is my ſaying, that they who come to Perfection, witneſs the true uſe of theſe things any ſhift at all, though he be pleaſed to term it ſo without any proof, after his wonted manner, according to which he addeth, *That under the pretence of Perfection we take men off from the practice of theſe duties, and ſo ſtrike at Chriſtianity in the vitals of it*; which though it fall of it ſelf as being a meer aſſertion, yet the contrary is above abundantly ſhown; He ſaith, *He doth not contradict himſelf in inferring a ſinleſs man to be ſinful*; He affirmed onely the *Quakers* conceitedly ſinleſs men to be ſinful, who diſcover much ſin in their pride, paſſion, bitterneſs, railing accuſations, adding, *If ſuch ſay they have no ſin they are but liars, and the truth is not in them.*

Anſw. There was no ſuch addition in his Dialogue as conceitedly ſinleſs, but abſolutly, He ſaid, *Bring me to the man that is ſinleſs*, and therefore his contradiction remains: Moreover let him name that *Quaker* if he can, that tould him he was Perfectly free from all ſin, and yet was guilty of thoſe crimes he ſpeaks of, elſe he can deduce nothing from his own falſe ſuppoſition.

Pag. 127. To prove the Saints continuance allwayes in ſin, he deſires to remark that, 1 *Joh.* 18 *It is even ſuch, who have heard, ſeen and handled of the word of God* &c. *Who ſayeth, If we have no ſin we are liars*; And here indeed is to be obſerved his deteſtable Impudence in adding to the Scripture words, citing *verſ.* 7. which he repeats thus, *We who are cleanſed from the guilt of ſin*, whereas there is no ſuch word as *Guilt* in that place, but onely, *We are cleanſed from all ſin*, which imports a cleanſing from the filth; Mark theſe words *vers.* 9. *From all unrighteouſneſs*; now when the Guilt is onely taken away and the filth remaineth, as *W. M.* falſly ſuppoſes, they could not be ſaid to be cleanſed from all unrighteouſneſs; for

it is an improper ſpeech to ſay we are cleanſed from Guilt, it is from the filth we are cleanſed, and the Guilt is forgiven us; Therefore ſaith the Apoſtle, *vers.* 9. firſt, *He is faithful to forgive us*, and next he adds, *To cleanſe us from all unrighteouſneſs*; nor will *Johns* ſaying, *If we ſay we have no ſin*, import *John* himſelf to be of that number, more then the Apoſtle *James* ſpaking of the Tongue *Jam.* 3. 9. ſaying, *There-with curſe we men who are made after the ſimilitude of God*; will prove *James* to have been of theſe curſers. Now in anſwer to me ſhowing that Scripture 1 *Joh.* 1. 8. is conditional elſe it would contradict what followes, *vers.* 9. *chap.* 24. and *chap.* 3, 9. He returneth no anſwer but his own aſſertions; He ſaith, *The* 9. *vers ſpeaketh of forgiveneſs*, but it alſo adds cleanſing as is above obſerved. He ſaith, *That* 1 Joh. 2, 4. *Is underſtood of a ſincere not abſolute keeping of the Commands of God*, but for this he brings no proof at all; He ſaith, *That* Joh. 3. 9. *Whoſoever is born of God ſinneth not, is meant of ſinning unto death, from which the child of God is ſecured*, The reaſon he gives of this gloſs is, becauſe the Apoſtle, *ch.* 5. *v.* 16. ſpeaketh, *of a ſin unto death*, which Sin *W. M.* ſuppoſeth to be that the Apoſtle means, *He that's born of God cannot commit*: but to prove this ſuppoſition we have nothing but his own meer aſſertion: Reader, Theſe are the beſt and ſtrongeſt arguments he hath to prove his Doctrines.

His *Seventeenth Head, Pag.* 128. Is to ſhew his Doctrines, not to be acceptable to the wicked, and his *Eighteenth Head, Pag.* 131. Is to prove ours to be ſo, But he is ſo pittifully ridiculous in this matter, that ſuch as have the leaſt meaſure of underſtanding, and are unprejudiced, cannot but ſee his weakneſs: Yet that he may be left altogether without a cover, I ſhall anſwer his objections, and leave the unbiaſſed Reader as he deſires to judge, which Principles in their nature have moſt tendency to ſtrike at or foſter wickedneſs: To prove that it is not acceptable to the wicked to hear they muſt alwayes ſin, He ſayes, *Some are ſo conceited of their honeſty that they cannot be convinced of their ſins, And that Mortification of ſin is diſtaſtful to them*; But how he makes this to anſwer the other is not tould us, if hypocrites love not to hear of their ſins, it doth not therefore follow, that pleading for a conſtant continuance in ſin, is not acceptable to the wicked, they may be the eaſier induced to acknowledg their ſins, that they hear it tould them for ſound and ſolid Doctrine, that they may be reputed good Saints and Chriſtians

Christians though they alwayes remain in them, to prove that their Doctrine of imputative Righteousnes, and of Election and Reprobation, is not pleasing to the wicked, He sayes, *Some wicked men scof at them*, what then, so some wicked men scof at the folly of *Machametanism*, will it therefore follow their Doctrine is good? The question is, Whether their Doctrine of mens being altogether reputed Righteous in the sight of God, by a Righteousnes altogether without them, and mens being elected to Life from all Eternity, without any respect to their deeds be not more acceptable to the wicked, then to tell them they must seek to be Justified by the Righteousnes of God wrought in them? And as they are joyned to the elect Seed Christ Jesus, born again and brought forth in them which worketh out all iniquity and unrighteousnes in them. Now this he hath not in the least offered to answer: After the like manner, Whereas I shew it is more acceptable to the wicked to hear that the outward Letter is the Rule, which they can bend and twin, then the inward which cannot be so twisted, He sayes, *Some wicked men could wish there were no such outward rule, and that some understand not what is intended by Gods immediate speaking, but hate the Ministery of the word*, both which answers make nothing to the purpose; What though wicked men hate the Scripture and the Ministry, doth it therefore follow that it is not more acceptable to them to hear; this is their only rule which they can twin as they please, then the inward which cannot be twined as the Scriptures may, nor bribed as the Ministry of men. He confesses, *They allow of Laces, Ribbons, Gold Rings*, &c. and other superfluities, And therefore cannot deny, but that their Doctrine therein is acceptable to the wicked; His shift is here, *That People ought not to exceed their rank and quality*, aledging, *The Apostle onely condems this*, 1 Tim. 2. 9. But that his detestable wresting of the Scripture may be manifest I shall cite the Apostles words: *In like manner also, that women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamfastnes and sobriety; not with broydred hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly aray*; is there any word here that they should only not exceed their rank; who cannot but abominate his abusing of Scripture. And whereas he sayes, *He thinks they should be sparing of lawful games and recreations*, it seems their deeds sute not their thoughts in this matter, or else it must be accounted a sparingness with him, not onely to spend much of the day in Field sports, but even largely of the night in Carding,

ing, &c. For ſo to my certain knowledg, ſome of his Brethren in the Prieſthood, of the Synod of *Aberd en*, are found doing and juſtifying themſelves in it. As to the Sabbath, he offereth not in the leaſt to anſwer, That wherein I ſhew it was acceptable to the wicked, according to the ſame rate; In anſwer to my aſſertion, That the wicked love well to hear that they may be members of the Church without having infallible evidence of Holyneſs; He asketh, *If all the Members of the Quakers Church have ſo*, adding, *That our raw conceited proſelytes, are ſo ignorant and yet ſo confident, That ſober men ſuſpect them to be in a fools Paradice*; Firſt, as this is a meer ſhift and no reply, to diſprove the Principle aforeſaid to be acceptable to the wicked, ſo likewiſe if his Spirit had not been in a raw conceited poſture, filled both with ignorance and confidence, he had not ſuffered himſelf ſo far to fall in a fools Paradice, as to imagine this his meer proofleſs Calumny, with many more his groundleſs aſſertions would have any weight with ſober men, not being backed with any argument: He addeth, *Their Doctrine, once in Grace and ever in Grace, hath no tendency to pleaſe the wicked, becauſe ſuch never had Grace, and therefore have no ground to think that belongeth unto them*; But ſeeing he himſelf confeſſeth, That ſuch as had true Grace, may fall both unto deteſtable practices, and Blaſphemous or Erronious Principles, may not ſuch then foſter themſelves in theſe evils, by ſaying, That ſince they once had true Grace they can never totally fall from it: That part of *Page* 72. of mine, where I ſhew by example how the wicked living among them, and being their Church Members, and alſo oppoſing and vilifiing us did declare their Principles to be more acceptable to the wicked then ours, he hath wholly waved, it ſeems he knew of no ſhift how to ſhufle by this, and therefore found it fitteſt altogether to omit it.

Head 18. *Pag.* 131. He ſaith, *The Quakers Religion is exceeding ſuitable to carnal hearts*, and thereupon he inſtanceth ſome particulars ſaying, *They are pleaſing to the wicked*, without offering any reaſon; The Reader upon the particular debate of theſe matters in their places, will obſerve how he was neceſſitated to bottom this concluſion of theſe Principles being ſutable to carnal hearts, upon the meer credit of his own affirmation, and therefore it is no wonder he adds, *That he is wearied raking in this dunghil*; It is high time for him to leave of trampling in ſuch miry ſtuff as is the whole bulk of his Book, and no doubt a dunghil is a very fit term for ſuch a

dirty

durty product, as is theſe droſly dregs of his dark underſtanding; I charged him in the end of mine for lying to God, for that in the Prayer, he endeth his Dialogue with, he uſeth theſe words, *Follow with thy bleſſing, That which* We *have been about*, which now he is ſo far from clearing himſelf of, that he now acknowledges it was onely a ſuppoſed conference, And therefore it was a lie, yea a mocking of God, to deſire him to accompany a meer ſuppolition with his bleſſing; as for his expreſſing pitty towards the leduced and wiſhing God to reclaim them, it was not for that I challenged him, but for his deſiring God to accompany with his bleſſing a meer Chymæra, which never was, and therefore his beſt ſhift for this is, *What is it that ſome men will not carp at eſpecially the Quakers*, of whom he addeth, a pious Miniſter hath ſaid, *That their Religion conſiſts in railing*; and then he goes on and tels ſome terms, wherewith that Perſon ſayes, The *Quakers* have named the Miniſters of Chriſt.

Anſw. Firſt, The Teſtimony of his ſuppoſed pious Miniſter is no more to be recieved in this caſe then *W. M.* his own, and to ſay the *Quakers* gave theſe names he mentions to the Miniſters of Chriſt, is to take for granted the thing in debate, for the *Quakers* deny them to be ſuch: And is juſt one as if a *Papiſt* ſhould ſay, *Luther* and his aſſotiates Religion conſiſted in railling, becauſe they called (as to the *Papiſts*) their holy Mother the Church of *Rome* a *Srumpet*, a *Whore*, *the Mother of fornications*, *Babilon*, &c. and all her devote Clergy no better then *Balls Prieſts*, *filthy Dogs*, *blind Guids*, *Liars*, *Diſſemblers*, &c. and all theſe other denominations *W. M.* men ions the *Quakers* give his Brethren; dare he deny but there are ſome of his Fraternity guilty of all theſe terms, And what knoweth he but the *Quakers* have applied them aright; it is manifeſt enough, ſome of theſe terms are too applicable to them all, ſuch as blind Guids, Perſecutors: It is here obſerveable, That among all theſe denominations he aledges, the *Quakers* give him and his Brethren, he hath omitted the two, both moſt frequently uſed againſt them by the *Quakers*, and moſt univerſally deſerved by his fellow Prieſts, *Viz.* Hirelings and Time-ſervers; It ſeems he feared every Reader would have found them applicable: Herein do we find our ſelves Juſtified both before God and good men, that we have named them no otherwayes then as their Guilt deſerved, and that we have no enmity nor hatred at any mans Perſon, nor have deſired to harme

harme it, wheras while they plead forbearance for themselves, that we should not speak the truth plainly to them, and of them, terming our so doing Railing and Reviling, yet they are not ashamed to speak all manner of evil falsly against us, Railing at us without a cause; And not onely so, but stiring up so far as they can the Magistrate, to cause us to be beat, imprisoned, and persecuted, both in our Bodies, Estates, and Libertys; by offering to banish us out of our Native Contryes: Yea and cut us off if they could from the face of the Earth. Let the unprejudiced Judge who showes forth here most meekness or most wrath.

Post-script.

WHereas *W. M.* in his fifth Head concerning the Scriptures, and in his twelfth Head, *Pag.* 96. concerning the Ministry, aledgeth, *That these words of the Apostle Paul* mentioned by me, 1 *Cor.* 14. 30. Ye may all Prophecy one by one; *Is restricted to Prophets &c. not for the common order of the Church*: Adding, *That except we could prove all our Teachers to be Prophets, we ought not to lay claime to that Scripture*: I would desire him to answer his Brother *Samuel Rutherfords* (Professor of Devinity at St. *Andrews*, So called; who in his Book intitled, *The due Right of Presbytery*, Page 466, 467.) eight arguments, wherein he hath proved it to be of Pastors, *&c.* not of extraordinary Prophets, and thereby hath saved me that labour.

This coming to my hands after the other was committed to the Press, was the cause of its not being inserted in the due place.

THE END.